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#### Observation 1 is the Cuban Embargo:

#### The Castros would win a short term political victory when the embargo ended but in the long term it would collapse the ‘rally round the flag’ effect- comparatively better strategy

[Alvaro Vargas Llosa](http://www.independent.org/aboutus/person_detail.asp?id=494) [a Senior Fellow of [The Center on Global Prosperity](http://www.independent.org/research/cogp/) at the Independent Institute, who has been a nationally syndicated columnist for the Washington Post Writers Group and among his books, Liberty for Latin America, received the Sir Anthony Fisher International Memorial Award for its contribution to the cause of freedom in 2006 andLessons from the Poor: Triumph of the Entrepreneurial Spirit was awarded the Templeton Freedom Award (2010). He was appointed Young Global Leader 2007 by the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland] Should the Cuban Embargo be Lifted? April 29, 2009¶ <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2492>

I have been conflicted on this issue for years. Until not long ago, I favored the embargo. As an advocate for free trade, I would normally have called such a measure an unacceptable restriction on the freedom of people to trade with whomever they pleased. But I thought that trading with a regime that had killed, jailed, exiled or muzzled countless of its citizens for decades was not a worthy objective, as it would also preserve that dictatorship. Any transaction with Cuba would also benefit the government. After all, the authorities were already skimming 20 percent of the remittances from Cuban-Americans and 90 percent of the salary paid to Cubans by non-American foreign investors.¶ Eventually, I admitted to myself that there was an intolerable inconsistency in my thinking. No democracy based on liberty should tell its citizens what country to visit or whom to trade with, regardless of the government under which they live. Even though the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raul, would obtain a political victory in the very short run, the embargo could no longer be justified.¶ But this is not the reasoning coming from the most vocal critics of U.S. sanctions these days. Many of them fail to even mention the fraud that is a system which bases its legitimacy on the renunciation of capitalism and at the same time implores capitalism to come to its rescue. There is also an endearing hypocrisy among those who decry the embargo but devote hardly any time to denouncing the island’s half-century tyranny under the Castros.¶ Another risible subterfuge attributes the catastrophe that is Cuba’s economy on Washington’s decision to cut off economic relations in 1962 after a wave of expropriations against American interests. The amnesiacs conveniently forget that in 1958, Cuba’s socioeconomic condition was similar to Spain’s and Portugal’s and the standard of living of its citizens was behind only those of Argentines and Uruguayans in Latin America. Many of the critics also seem to suffer what French writer Jean-Francois Revel used to call “moral hemiplegia”—a tendency to see fault only on one side of the political spectrum: I never heard Cuba’s champions complain about sanctions against right-wing dictatorships.¶ Sometimes, sanctions work, sometimes they don’t. A study by Gary Hufbauer, Jeffrey Schott, Kimberly Elliot and Barbara Oegg titled “Economic Sanctions Reconsidered” analyzes dozens of cases of sanctions since World War I. In about a third of them, they worked either because they helped to topple the regime (South Africa) or because they forced the dictator to make major concessions (Libya). Archbishop Desmond Tutu told me a few months ago in San Francisco that he was convinced that international sanctions were crucial in defeating apartheid in his home country. In the cases in which the embargo worked, the sanctions were applied by many countries and the affected regimes were already severely discredited or weakened.¶ In the cases in which sanctions have not worked—Saddam Hussein between 1990 and 2003, and North Korea today—the dictatorships were able to isolate themselves from the effects and concentrate them on the population. In some countries, a certain sense of pride helped defend the government against foreign sanctions—which is why the measures applied by the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia in 1948, China in 1960 and Albania in 1961 were largely useless.¶ In the case of Cuba, the Castro regime has been able to whip up a nationalist sentiment against the U.S. embargo. More significantly, it has managed to offset much of the effects over the years in large part because the Soviets subsidized the island for three decades, because the regime welcomed Canadian, Mexican and European capital after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and because Venezuela is its new patron.¶ But these arguments against the U.S. embargo are mostly practical. Ultimately, the argument against the sanctions is a moral one. It is not acceptable for a government to abolish individual choice in matters of trade and travel. The only acceptable form of economic embargo is when citizens, not governments, decide not do business with a dictatorship, be that of Burma, Zimbabwe or Cuba.

#### There are no disads to ending the embargo, it’s not effective now but the Castros are using it to solidify power

[Steve Chapman](http://reason.com/people/steve-chapman/all) [a columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune]¶ It's Time to End the U.S. Embargo of Cuba¶ The U.S. government has been tireless in pursuing a policy that does not look better with time¶ April 15, 2013¶ <http://reason.com/archives/2013/04/15/its-time-to-end-the-us-embargo-of-cuba>

Well, maybe I exaggerate. It's just possible that the musical couple's presence or absence was utterly irrelevant to Cuba's future. Americans have somewhat less control over the island than we like to imagine. The U.S. embargo of Cuba has been in effect since 1962, with no end in sight. Fidel Castro's government has somehow managed to outlast the Soviet Union, Montgomery Ward, rotary-dial telephones and 10 American presidents. The boycott adheres to the stubborn logic of governmental action. It was created to solve a problem: the existence of a communist government 90 miles off our shores. It failed to solve that problem. But its failure is taken as proof of its everlasting necessity. If there is any lesson to be drawn from this dismal experience, though, it's that the economic quarantine has been either 1) grossly ineffectual or 2) positively helpful to the regime The first would not be surprising, if only because economic sanctions almost never work. Iraq under Saddam Hussein? Nope. Iran? Still waiting. North Korea? Don't make me laugh. What makes this embargo even less promising is that we have so little help in trying to apply the squeeze. Nearly 200 countries allow trade with Cuba. Tourists from Canada and Europe flock there in search of beaches, nightlife and Havana cigars, bringing hard currency with them. So even if starving the country into submission could work, Cuba hasn't starved and won't anytime soon. Nor is it implausible to suspect that the boycott has been the best thing that ever happened to the Castro brothers, providing them a scapegoat for the nation's many economic ills. The implacable hostility of the Yankee imperialists also serves to align Cuban nationalism with Cuban communism. Even Cubans who don't like Castro may not relish being told what to do by the superpower next door.

#### The embargo sends mixed signals to the world regarding rogue regimes

[Mitchell Bustillo](http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/author/mitchell-bustillo/) [will be attending Columbia University in the fall where he will be majoring in Engineering with a minor in Economics on a Pre-Law track. He is a first-generation Cuban-American, a Hispanic Heritage Foundation Gold Medallion Winner, and a former United States Senate Page, appointed by Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison. He one day hopes to return to the Hill]¶ Time to Strengthen the Cuban Embargo¶ May 9, 2013¶ <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/05/09/time-to-strengthen-the-cuban-embargo/>

When thinking of U.S.-Cuba relations, the trade embargo, or el bloqueo, is first and foremost on people’s minds. In 2009, President Barack Obama eased the travel ban, allowing Cuban-Americans to travel freely to Cuba, and again in 2011, allowing students and religious missionaries to travel to Cuba, as recently demonstrated by American pop culture figures, Beyoncé and her husband Jay-Z. Despite a history of hostile transgressions, the U.S. is inconsistent with its implementation of the embargo, which sends mixed signals to Havana and displays our weak foreign policy regarding Cuba.

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic engagement toward Cuba by ending the Cuban Embargo.

#### “Cuban Embargo” is a legally recognized term- it refers to the grouping of laws that make up US policy towards Cuba

Cuba Study Group [¶ Our Mission Our mission is to help facilitate a peaceful transition in Cuba leading to a free and open society, respect for human rights and the rule of law, a productive, market-based economy and the reunification of the Cuban nation. We aim to facilitate change, help empower individuals and promote civil society development.¶ The Cuba Study Group is a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization. We do not receive, nor accept, funding from any U.S. government source, or government-funded subcontractor.¶ Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba¶ February 2013

<http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032>

The U.S. embargo toward Cuba is a collection of prohibitions, restrictions and sanctions derived from several laws ¶ that has been in effect for more than 50 years. Taken together and compounded with the designation of Cuba as a ¶ “state sponsor of terrorism,” they result in the most severe set of sanctions and restrictions applied against any current adversary of the United States. This collection of sanctions was first codified into law by the Cuban Democracy ¶ Act of 1992 (“Torricelli”), severely tightened by the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 (“HelmsBurton”), and modified by the Trade Sanctions and Reform Act of 2000 (“TSRA”), thus transferring almost absolute ¶ authority over U.S. policy toward Cuba from the Executive Branch to the U.S. Congress.¶ The codification of the U.S. embargo against Cuba has failed to accomplish its objectives, as stated in Helms-Burton, ¶ of causing regime change and restoring democracy in Cuba. Continuing to ignore this obvious truth is not only counterproductive to the interests of the United States, but also increasingly damaging to Cuban civil society, including ¶ the more than 400,000 Cubans now working as licensed private entrepreneurs, because it places the burden of sanctions squarely on their shoulders to bear.¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ At a time when Cuba seems headed toward a path of change and reforms, albeit slower than desired, and a real debate ¶ seems to be emerging within Cuba’s elite regarding its future, the inflexibility of U.S. policy has the ironic effect of hurting and delaying the very changes it seeks to produce by severely limiting Cuba’s ability to implement major economic ¶ reforms and strengthening the hand of the reactionaries, rather than the reformers, within the Cuban government. ¶ Moreover, Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions in Torricelli and TSRA deny the United States the flexibility to ¶ address dynamic conditions in Cuba in a strategic and proactive way. They effectively tie the President’s hands in ¶ responding to developments on the Island, placing the impetus for taking advantage of the processes of change in Cuba ¶ in hands of hard-liners among Cuba’s ruling elites, whose interests are best served by the perpetuation of the embargo. ¶ The Cuba Study Group is publishing this whitepaper to acknowledge that a Cuba policy fundamentally based on blanket unilateral sanctions and isolation has been grossly ineffective for more than half a century; it disproportionately ¶ hurts the Cuban people and is counterproductive to the creation of an enabling transitional environment in Cuba ¶ where civil society can prosper and bring about the desired social, political and economic changes for which we long. ¶ Thus, we call for the repeal of the Helms-Burton Act, its related statutory provisions in Torricelli and TSRA, and for ¶ the restoration of authority over U.S.-Cuba policy to the Executive Branch. It is our belief that we can no longer ¶ afford to ignore the failure of this legislation.¶ Seventeen years after its enactment, the Helms-Burton Act—which further codified the sanctions framework commonly referred to as the U.S. embargo against Cuba and conditions its suspension on the existence of a transition or ¶ democratic government in Cuba—has proven to be a counterproductive policy that has failed to achieve its stated ¶ purposes in an increasingly interconnected world.

#### Observation 2: The Advantages

### Adv 1: Credibility

#### US credibility on the international stage is low now- increased engagement key

Patrick Duddy & Frank O. Mora [Patrick Duddy served as U.S. ambassador to Venezuela from 2007 until 2010 and is currently visiting senior lecturer at Duke University. Frank O. Mora is incoming director of the Latin American and Caribbean Center, Florida International University, and former deputy assistant secretary of Defense, Western Hemisphere (2009-2013)]¶ ¶ 05.01.2013¶ ¶ ¶ Latin America: Is U.S. influence waning?¶ ¶ <http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/01/3375160/latin-america-is-us-influence.html>

Is U.S. influence in Latin America on the wane? It depends how you look at it.¶ As President Obama travels to Mexico and Costa Rica, it’s likely the pundits will once again underscore what some perceive to be the eroding influence of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Some will point to the decline in foreign aid or the absence of an overarching policy with an inspiring moniker like “Alliance for Progress” or “Enterprise Area of the Americas” as evidence that the United States is failing to embrace the opportunities of a region that is more important to this country than ever.¶ The reality is a lot more complicated. Forty-two percent of all U.S. exports flow to the Western Hemisphere. In many ways, U.S. engagement in the Americas is more pervasive than ever, even if more diffused. That is in part because the peoples of the Western Hemisphere are not waiting for governments to choreograph their interactions.¶ A more-nuanced assessment inevitably will highlight the complex, multidimensional ties between the United States and the rest of the hemisphere. In fact, it may be that we need to change the way we think and talk about the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. We also need to resist the temptation to embrace overly reductive yardsticks for judging our standing in the hemisphere.¶ As Moises Naim notes in his recent book, The End of Power, there has been an important change in power distribution in the world away from states toward an expanding and increasingly mobile set of actors that are dramatically shaping the nature and scope of global relationships. In Latin America, many of the most substantive and dynamic forms of engagement are occurring in a web of cross-national relationships involving small and large companies, people-to-people contact through student exchanges and social media, travel and migration.¶ Trade and investment remain the most enduring and measurable dimensions of U.S. relations with the region. It is certainly the case that our economic interests alone would justify more U.S. attention to the region. Many observers who worry about declining U.S. influence in this area point to the rise of trade with China and the presence of European companies and investors.

#### Now is the key time- the plan sends a signal to Latin America that the US is willing to be reasonable and update its trade policies. The US can gain regional influence and cooperation by lifting the embargo, this boosts US credibility in the region and salvages regional cooperation

ROBERT E. WHITE [[Robert E. White](http://www.ciponline.org/about-us/experts-staff/robert_white), a senior fellow at the Center for International Policy, was the United States ambassador to Paraguay from 1977 to 1979 and to El Salvador from 1980 to 1981]¶ Published: March 7, 2013¶ After Chávez, a Chance to Rethink Relations With Cuba¶ <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/08/opinion/after-chavez-hope-for-good-neighbors-in-latin-america.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0&partner=rss&emc=rss>

¶ Yet for a half-century, our policies toward our southern neighbors have alternated between intervention and neglect, inappropriate meddling and missed opportunities. The death this week of President [Hugo Chávez](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/hugo_chavez/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Venezuela — who along with Fidel Castro of [Cuba](http://www.nytimes.com/info/cuba?inline=nyt-geo) was perhaps the most vociferous critic of the United States among the political leaders of the Western Hemisphere in recent decades — offers an opportunity to restore bonds with potential allies who share the American goal of prosperity.¶ Throughout his career, the autocratic Mr. Chávez used our embargo as a wedge with which to antagonize the United States and alienate its supporters. His fuel helped prop up the rule of Mr. Castro and his brother Raúl, Cuba’s current president. The embargo no longer serves any useful purpose (if it ever did at all); President Obama should end it, though it would mean overcoming powerful opposition from Cuban-American lawmakers in Congress.¶ An end to the Cuba embargo would send a powerful signal to all of Latin America that the United States wants a new, warmer relationship with democratic forces seeking social change throughout the Americas.¶ I joined the State Department as a Foreign Service officer in the 1950s and chose to serve in Latin America in the 1960s. I was inspired by President John F. Kennedy’s creative response to the revolutionary fervor then sweeping Latin America. The 1959 Cuban revolution, led by the charismatic Fidel Castro, had inspired revolts against the cruel dictatorships and corrupt pseudodemocracies that had dominated the region since the end of Spanish and Portuguese rule in the 19th century.¶ Kennedy had a charisma of his own, and it captured the imaginations of leaders who wanted democratic change, not violent revolution. Kennedy reacted to the threat of continental insurrection by creating the [Alliance for Progress](http://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/AllianceforProgress), a kind of Marshall Plan for the hemisphere that was calculated to achieve the same kind of results that saved Western Europe from Communism. He pledged billions of dollars to this effort. In hindsight, it may have been overly ambitious, even naïve, but Kennedy’s focus on Latin America rekindled the promise of the [Good Neighbor Policy](http://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/GoodNeighbor) of Franklin D. Roosevelt and transformed the whole concept of inter-American relations.¶ Tragically, after Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, the ideal of the Alliance for Progress crumbled and “la noche mas larga” — “the longest night” — began for the proponents of Latin American democracy. Military regimes flourished, democratic governments withered, moderate political and civil leaders were labeled Communists, rights of free speech and assembly were curtailed and human dignity crushed, largely because the United States abandoned all standards save that of anti-Communism.¶ During my Foreign Service career, I did what I could to oppose policies that supported dictators and closed off democratic alternatives. In 1981, as the ambassador to [El Salvador](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/elsalvador/index.html?inline=nyt-geo), I refused a demand by the secretary of state, [Alexander M. Haig Jr.](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/21/us/politics/21haig.html), that I use official channels to cover up the Salvadoran military’s responsibility for the murders of four American churchwomen. [I was fired and forced out of the Foreign Service.](http://www.nytimes.com/1981/03/12/world/former-envoy-to-el-salvador-says-his-views-have-led-to-his-ouster.html)¶ The Reagan administration, under the illusion that Cuba was the power driving the Salvadoran revolution, turned its policy over to the Pentagon and C.I.A., with predictable results. During the 1980s the United States helped expand the Salvadoran military, which was dominated by uniformed assassins. We armed them, trained them and covered up their crimes.¶ After our counterrevolutionary efforts failed to end the Salvadoran conflict, the Defense Department asked its research institute, the RAND Corporation, what had gone wrong. RAND analysts found that United States policy makers had refused to accept the obvious truth that the insurgents were rebelling against social injustice and state terror. As a result, “we pursued a policy unsettling to ourselves, for ends humiliating to the Salvadorans and at a cost disproportionate to any conventional conception of the national interest.”¶ Over the subsequent quarter-century, a series of profound political, social and economic changes have undermined the traditional power bases in Latin America and, with them, longstanding regional institutions like the Organization of American States. The organization, which is headquartered in Washington and which excluded Cuba in 1962, was seen as irrelevant by Mr. Chávez. He promoted the creation of the [Community of Latin American and Caribbean States](http://www.celac.gob.ve/index.php?lang=en) — which excludes the United States and Canada — as an alternative.¶ At a regional meeting that included Cuba and excluded the United States, Mr. Chávez said that “the most positive thing for the independence of our continent is that we meet alone without the hegemony of empire.”¶ Mr. Chávez was masterful at manipulating America’s antagonism toward Fidel Castro as a rhetorical stick with which to attack the United States as an imperialist aggressor, an enemy of progressive change, interested mainly in treating Latin America as a vassal continent, a source of cheap commodities and labor.¶ Like its predecessors, the Obama administration has given few signs that it has grasped the magnitude of these changes or cares about their consequences. After President Obama took office in 2009, Latin America’s leading statesman at the time, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, then the president of Brazil, urged Mr. Obama to normalize relations with Cuba.¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ Lula, as he is universally known, correctly identified our Cuba policy as the chief stumbling block to renewed ties with Latin America, as it had been since the very early years of the Castro regime.¶ After the failure of the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, Washington set out to accomplish by stealth and economic strangulation what it had failed to do by frontal attack. But the clumsy mix of covert action and porous boycott succeeded primarily in bringing shame on the United States and turning Mr. Castro into a folk hero.¶ And even now, despite the relaxing of travel restrictions and Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will retire in 2018, the implacable hatred of many within the Cuban exile community continues. The fact that two of the three Cuban-American members of the Senate — Marco Rubio of Florida and Ted Cruz of Texas — are rising stars in the Republican Party complicates further the potential for a recalibration of Cuban-American relations. (The third member, Senator Robert Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey, is the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but his power has been weakened by a continuing ethics controversy.)¶ Are there any other examples in the history of diplomacy where the leaders of a small, weak nation can prevent a great power from acting in its own best interest merely by staying alive?¶ The re-election of President Obama, and the death of Mr. Chávez, give America a chance to reassess the irrational hold on our imaginations that Fidel Castro has exerted for five decades. The president and his new secretary of state, John Kerry, should quietly reach out to Latin American leaders like President [Juan Manuel Santos](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/juan_manuel_santos/index.html) of Colombia and [José Miguel Insulza](http://www.oas.org/en/about/secretary_general.asp), secretary general of the Organization of American States. The message should be simple: The president is prepared to show some flexibility on Cuba and asks your help.¶ Such a simple request could transform the Cuban issue from a bilateral problem into a multilateral challenge. It would then be up to Latin Americans to devise a policy that would help Cuba achieve a sufficient measure of democratic change to justify its reintegration into a hemisphere composed entirely of elected governments.¶ If, however, our present policy paralysis continues, we will soon see the emergence of two rival camps, the United States versus Latin America. While Washington would continue to enjoy friendly relations with individual countries like Brazil, Mexico and Colombia, the vision of Roosevelt and Kennedy of a hemisphere of partners cooperating in matters of common concern would be reduced to a historical footnote.

#### US-Latin American relations solve a laundry list of existential scenarios

Shifter 12 (Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>)  
  
There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties . Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources . Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance . For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future . The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights . With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership.

### Adv 2: Economy

#### Economic collapse is coming now- multiple warrants

Michael T. Snyder [a graduate of the University of Florida law school and he worked as an attorney in Washington D.C.. Today, Michael is best known for his work as the publisher of The Economic Collapse Blog] FEBRUARY 21, 2013¶ WARNING: 20 Signs The U.S. Economy May Collapse in Coming Months¶ <http://www.mrconservative.com/2013/02/5125-signs-us-economy-may-collapse-in-coming-months/>

Is the U.S. economy about to experience a major downturn? Unfortunately, there are a whole bunch of signs that economic activity in the United States is really slowing down right now. Freight volumes and freight expenditures are way down, consumer confidence has declined sharply, major retail chains all over America are closing hundreds of stores, and the “sequester” threatens to give the American people their first significant opportunity to experience what “austerity” tastes like. Gas prices are going up rapidly, corporate insiders are dumping massive amounts of stock and there are high profile corporate bankruptcies in the news almost every single day now.¶ In many ways, what we are going through right now feels very similar to 2008 before the crash happened. Back then the warning signs of economic trouble were very obvious, but our politicians and the mainstream media insisted that everything was just fine, and the stock market was very much detached from reality. When the stock market did finally catch up with reality, it happened very, very rapidly. Sadly, most people do not appear to have learned any lessons from the crisis of 2008. Americans continue to rack up staggering amounts of debt, and Wall Street is more reckless than ever. As a society, we seem to have concluded that 2008 was just a temporary malfunction rather than an indication that our entire system was fundamentally flawed. In the end, we will pay a great price for our overconfidence and our recklessness.¶ So what will the rest of 2013 bring?¶ Hopefully the economy will remain stable for as long as possible, but right now things do not look particularly promising.¶ There are 20 signs the U.S. Economy may collapse in the coming months…..¶ Gas prices, which were sky high, are now back on the rise, and predicted in the future only to rise more¶ #1 Freight shipment volumes have hit their lowest level in two years, and freight expenditures have gone negative for the first time since the last recession.¶ #2 The average price of a gallon of gasoline has risen by more than 50 cents over the past two months. This is making things tougher on our economy, because nearly every form of economic activity involves moving people or goods around.¶ #3 Reader’s Digest, once one of the most popular magazines in the world, has filed for bankruptcy.¶ #4 Atlantic City’s newest casino, Revel, has just filed for bankruptcy. It had been hoped that Revel would help lead a turnaround for Atlantic City.¶ #5 A state-appointed review board has determined that there is “no satisfactory plan” to solve Detroit’s financial emergency, and many believe that bankruptcy is imminent. If Detroit does declare bankruptcy, it will be the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history.¶ Cel phone sales, once taken as a sign of global economic growth, are now for the first time in decline¶ #6 David Gallagher, the CEO of Town Sports International, recently said that his company is struggling right now because consumers simply do not have as much disposable income anymore…¶ “As we moved into January membership trends were tracking to expectations in the first half of the month, but fell off track and did not meet our expectations in the second half of the month. We believe the driver of this was the rapid decline in consumer sentiment that has been reported and is connected to the reduction in net pay consumers earn given the changes in tax rates that went into effect in January.”¶ #7 According to the Conference Board, consumer confidence in the U.S. has hit its lowest level in more than a year.¶ #8 Sales of the Apple iPhone have been slower than projected, and as a result Chinese manufacturing giant FoxConn has instituted a hiring freeze. The following is from a CNET report that was posted on Wednesday…¶ The Financial Times noted that it was the first time since a 2009 downturn that the company opted to halt hiring in all of its facilities across the country. The publication talked to multiple recruiters.¶ The actions taken by Foxconn fuel the concern over the perceived weakened demand for the iPhone 5 and slumping sentiment around Apple in general, with production activity a leading indicator of interest in the product.¶ #9 In 2012, global cell phone sales posted their first decline since the end of the last recession.¶ #10 We appear to be in the midst of a “retail apocalypse”. It is being projected that Sears, J.C. Penney, Best Buy and RadioShack will also close hundreds of stores by the end of 2013.¶ The “sequester” which could go into effect on March 1st, could cripple the economy.¶ #11 An internal memo authored by a Wal-Mart executive that was recently leaked to the press said that February sales were a “total disaster” and that the beginning of February was the “worst start to a month I have seen in my ~7 years with the company.”¶ #12 If Congress does not do anything and “sequestration” goes into effect on March 1st, the Pentagon says that approximately 800,000 civilian employees will be facing mandatory furloughs.¶ #13 Barack Obama is admitting that the “sequester” could have a crippling impact on the U.S. economy. The following is from a recent CNBC article…¶ Obama cautioned that if the $85 billion in immediate cuts — known as the sequester — occur, the full range of government would feel the effects. Among those he listed: furloughed FBI agents, reductions in spending for communities to pay police and fire personnel and teachers, and decreased ability to respond to threats around the world.¶ He said the consequences would be felt across the economy.¶ “People will lose their jobs,” he said. “The unemployment rate might tick up again.”¶ #14 If the “sequester” is allowed to go into effect, the CBO is projecting that it will cause U.S. GDP growth to go down by at least 0.6 percent and that it will “reduce job growth by 750,000 jobs”.¶ #15 According to a recent Gallup survey, 65 percent of all Americans believe that 2013 will be a year of “economic difficulty”, and 50 percent of all Americans believe that the “best days” of America are now in the past.¶ GDP growth was 1.5% in 2012, every time GDP is this low for an entire year – across U.S. History, a recession has always followed.¶ #16 U.S. GDP actually contracted at an annual rate of 0.1 percent during the fourth quarter of 2012. This was the first GDP contraction that the official numbers have shown in more than three years.¶ #17 For the entire year of 2012, U.S. GDP growth was only about 1.5 percent. According to Art Cashin, every time GDP growth has fallen this low for an entire year, the U.S. economy has always ended up going into a recession.¶

#### The plan solves it- Lifting the embargo creates jobs in both nations and increases trade- boosts the economy all around

SAUL LANDAU and NELSON P. VALDES¶ [Saul Landau, Professor Emeritus, California State University, Pomona,Nelson P. Valdes is Professor Emeritus, University of New Mexico]¶ JANUARY 29, 2013¶ A Boon for Cuban-American Entrepreneurs¶ The Economics of the Cuban Embargo¶ <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/01/29/the-economics-of-the-cuban-embargo/>

The time has come and almost gone for Washington to repair its broken relations with Cuba. For 53 years the White House has maintained a punishing embargo on trade with Cuba. Its proponents, with the goal of removing Cuba’s revolutionary government, still plead: “give it time.”¶ In 2001 President George W. Bush allowed for an exception permitting US companies to sell agricultural products to Cuba for immediate payment, although imports from Cuba remained off limits. Other economic sectors received no benefits.¶ Cuban Americans particularly from south Florida now export goods and remittances to relatives and friends while importing profits from sales made to fellow Cubans in Cuba, giving them an advantage denied to the rest of the country.¶ Washington pundits attribute superhuman strength to the anti-Castro lobby; thus no President would attempt to lift the trade and travel embargoes on the island. Yet, Cuban Americans trade with and travel to Cuba freely on a daily basis. The “embargo” applies to everyone except Cuban Americans.¶ This growing international trade, disguised as sending goods to needy family members in Cuba, now includes filling the hulls on 10 or more daily charter flights from US cities to Cuba. Cuban Americans send goods, often with “mules,” to provide family members in Cuba, needing supplies for their businesses. The “mules” return with cash, derived from sales of these goods. Some of the new Cuban stores and restaurants supplied by Miami-based Cubans make substantial profits, some of which get spent in Cuba, and ends up in Cuba’s central bank.¶ Miami, the United States’ poorest large city, derives income because it provides jobs involved in buying and selling the goods sent to Cuba. Jobs also arise from routine tasks created around the daily charter flights to and from Cuba, and the fees collected from take offs and landings. Add to this, the work for accountants, book-keepers and others.¶ Some unemployed Cuban Americans get jobs as mules transporting the goods and money from one country to the other. Miami banks also benefit.¶ In Cuba, this trade also creates jobs and wealth. Mercedes runs a paladar [private restaurant]in Havana’s Vedado neighborhood, “because we draw tourists who like good food, which I serve at my paladar.”¶ Some paladar customers flew to Havana from Miami. These Cuban Americans come to visit relatives and maybe check on their new investments in Havana family-run businesses. “Relatives in Florida supply me with food I can’t get easily in Cuba,” Mercedes said, “like some spices, and packaged goods. I send them money for these products. They make a profit, and so do I. The government makes money from taxes I pay, and jobs grow in Cuba’s tourist industry.”¶ US-based charter flights have full hulls, even those with few passengers. One charter flight company manager told us: “Passengers don’t matter that much. The hull is totally full.”¶ Much of the Cuba trade flows through the Miami International Airport, meaning capital moves from the US to Cuba; most of the luggage contents, however, remain in Cuba. The boon to Miami airport services means jobs, fees and taxes, which remain as capital in south Florida. The goods purchased in south Florida by Cubans (relatives, mules, etc) benefit local businesses.¶ This trade multiplies jobs throughout the area — as well as it does for Cuba: In Miami sales emanate from stores and lead to jobs in transportation, parking, hotel facilities, restaurants, and luggage-handling. Count the businesses providing services to the people traveling to Cuba and sending goods there. Don’t omit the expanded police force, and extra officials required in immigration, and customs; nor fail to consider jobs servicing air planes, and their jetways, and additional personnel needed for landings and take offs, and extra jobs in airport administration and maintenance created by expanded travel. Think of Miami’s increased tax revenues.¶ South Florida represents a Cuban settler state within the United States. It counters its interests against those of the dominant society, with the society’s ignorant acquiescence. The Miami-based Cuban Americans and their Cuba-based families have used US-Cuba policy, the embargo representing the power of the nation for their own self-interest, and in order to attain a comparative advantage vis a vis the rest of the American population.¶ Since 1960, commitment to overthrow of the Cuban government has functioned as US foreign policy on Cuba, a policy now controlled informally by south Florida Cuban-Americans. The Cuban American ethnic enclave assumed the political power needed to turn south Florida into an autonomous Cuban settler state inside US boundaries, so that the embargo does not get applied to the Cuban American enclave. The enclave barons use the embargo to secure, for themselves, a protection of the Cuba trade monopoly. This challenges stated US national interests.¶ Camouflaged by ubiquitous anti-Castro rhetoric, the Cuban American entrepreneurs have manufactured a lucrative business with the island, regulated by the very government they pretend to hate. The rightwing congressional representatives pretend to fight for every law to punish the “Castro regime” while in practice turn a dead eye to the growing trade that helps Florida’s and Cuba’s economy. Preserve the embargo, but make an exception for Cuban Americans.¶ By recognizing the facts about this trade, the White House might become inspired to lift the embargo – a move to benefit all Americans. US government revenue would grow from opening trade and travel with Cuba. In the process we might also regain a missing piece of US sovereignty!

#### Economic conflicts cause extinction

Daguzan 2010 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, "Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings" November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threatenthe well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France.¶ ¶ He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings.¶ ¶ Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed.¶ ¶ He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges.¶ ¶ He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

### Adv 3: Democracy

#### Best empirical research proves trade liberalization like the plan spurs democracy

Daniel T. Griswold [associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies.¶ Before joining Cato, he served for 12 years as editorial page editor of The Gazette — the Colorado Springs, Colorado daily newspaper]¶ January 23, 2004¶ Globalist Perspective > Global Economy Does Trade Promote Democracy? <http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=3714>

Political scientists have long noted the link between economic openness on one side, and political reform and democracy on the other. When the Cato Institute's Daniel Griswold examined this theory in a new study, he not only came up with a fascinating ranking system — but also discovered some truly strange bedfellows.¶ Increased trade and economic integration promote civil and political freedoms directly by opening a society to new technology, communications and democratic ideas.¶ Freedom through trade?¶ Economic liberalization provides a counterweight to governmental power — and creates space for civil society.¶ And by promoting faster growth, trade promotes political freedom indirectly by creating an economically independent and political aware middle class.¶ The evidence from a new study that I authored for the Cato Institute, Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy, finds that those assertions rest on solid ground — in theory as well as the real world. [Click here](http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=3714#box) for a quick overview of how the study was conducted.¶ A striking correlation¶ The connection becomes evident when countries are grouped by quintiles — or fifths — according to their economic openness.¶ Of the 25 rated countries in the top quintile of economic openness, 21 are rated "Free" by Freedom House — and only one is rated "Not Free."¶ Strange bedfellows¶ In contrast, among the quintile of countries that are the least open economically, only seven are rated "Free" and nine are rated "Not Free."¶ In other words, the most economically open countries are three times more likely to enjoy full political and civil freedoms as those that are economically closed. Those that are closed are nine times more likely to completely suppress civil and political freedoms as those that are open.¶ The chart below produces its share of strange bedfellows. Despite their ideological and diplomatic differences, the United States and France occupy almost exactly the same real estate in terms of political freedom and economic openness.

#### Pressure fails to spur democracy in Cuba- only the plan’s removal of the antagonism fosters it

LARRY BIRNS [COHA-Council of Hemispheric Affairs- DIRECTOR]AND FREDERICK B. MILLS[COHA SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW ]¶ [Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now](http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)¶ –JANUARY 30, 2013¶ <http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/>

The anti-Castro lobby and their allies in the US Congress argue that the reforms coming out of Havana are too little too late and that political repression continues unabated. They continue to see the embargo as a tool for coercing either more dramatic reforms or regime change. It is true that the reformist tendency in Cuba does not include a qualitative move from a one party system to political pluralism. Lamentably, Cuba reportedly continues to use temporary detentions and the occasional jailing of non-violent dissidents to limit the parameters of political debate and total freedom of association. The authors agree that no non-violent Cuban dissident should be intimidated, detained or jailed. But continuing to maliciously turn the screws on Havana has never provided an incentive for more democracy in any sense of the word nor has it created a political opening into which Cuba, with confidence, could enter. The easing of tensions between Washington and Havana is more likely to contribute to the evolution of a more democratic form of socialism on the island, the early stages of which we may presently be witnessing. In any case the precise form of such change inevitably should and will be decided in Cuba, not in Washington or Miami.

#### The embargo crushes democracy in Cuba by encouraging Cuba work with anti-democratic nations. The plan sends a strong signal to push for widespread democracy

Daniel Hanson, Dayne Batten & Harrison Ealey [Daniel Hanson is an economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute.  Dayne Batten is affiliated with the University of North Carolina Department of Public Policy.  Harrison Ealey is a financial analyst]¶ It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba¶ 1/16/2013 ¶ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>

What’s worse, U.S. sanctions encourage Cuba to collaborate with regional players that are less friendly to American interests. For instance, in 2011, the country inked a deal with Venezuela for the construction of an underwater communications link, circumventing its need to connect with US-owned networks close to its shores.¶ Repealing the embargo would fit into an American precedent of lifting trade and travel restrictions to countries who demonstrate progress towards democratic ideals. Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were all offered normal trade relations in the 1970s after preliminary reforms even though they were still in clear violation of several US resolutions condemning their human rights practices. China, a communist country and perennial human rights abuser, is the U.S.’s second largest trading partner, and in November, trade restrictions against Myanmar were lessened notwithstanding a fifty year history of genocide and human trafficking propagated by its military government.¶ Which, of course, begs the question: when will the U.S. see fit to lift the embargo? If Cuba is trending towards democracy and free markets, what litmus test must be passed for the embargo to be rolled back?¶ The cost of the embargo to the United States is high in both dollar and moral terms, but it is higher for the Cuban people, who are cut off from the supposed champion of liberty in their hemisphere because of an antiquated Cold War dispute. The progress being made in Cuba could be accelerated with the help of American charitable relief, business innovation, and tourism.¶ A perpetual embargo on a developing nation that is moving towards reform makes little sense, especially when America’s allies are openly hostile to the embargo. It keeps a broader discussion about smart reform in Cuba from gaining life, and it makes no economic sense. It is time for the embargo to go.

#### And democracy is good

#### Democracy creates conditions that stave off wars

Gregg Easterbrook, writer, lecturer, and a senior editor of [The New Republic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_Republic). He was a fellow at the [Brookings Institution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brookings_Institution), a Washington, D.C. think tank, “The End of War?” THE NEW REPUBLIC, May 30, 2005, p. 18.

The spread of democracy has made another significant contribution to the decline of war. In 1975, only one-third of the world's nations held true multiparty elections; today two-thirds do, and the proportion continues to rise. In the last two decades, some 80 countries have joined the democratic column, while hardly any moved in the opposite direction. Increasingly, developing-world leaders observe the simple fact that the free nations are the strongest and richest ones, and this creates a powerful argument for the expansion of freedom. Theorists at least as far back as Immanuel Kant have posited that democratic societies would be much less likely to make war than other kinds of states. So far, this has proved true: Democracy-against-democracy fighting has been extremely rare. Prosperity and democracy tend to be mutually reinforcing. Now prosperity is rising in most of the world, amplifying the trend toward freedom. As ever-more nations become democracies, ever-less war can be expected, which is exactly what is being observed.

#### Democracy is key to prevent environmental destruction

Eric Neumayer, Professor of Environment and Development at the London School of Economics (LSE)

Head of the Department of Geography and Environment , JOURNAL OF PEACE RESEARCH, March 2002, pp. 156-159.

Taken together, the results reported in the last section provide strong evidence in favour of our hypothesis that democracies exhibit stronger international environmental commitment than non-democracies. This result appears to be relatively robust with respect to our different measures of environmental commitment. For the great majority of these proxies of environmental commitment, the democracy variables not only have the expected sign, but are also statistically significant. It is also quite robust with respect to our different measures of democracy. No single measure of democracy provides systematically different estimates in terms of sign of coefficients and their statistical significance from the other three.21 Equally satisfying is that the coefficients and their significance remain roughly the same whether developed countries are included in the full sample or excluded in the restricted sample. In other words, the results are not simply triggered by the presence of developed democratic countries. Almost throughout, we observe that the coefficients for the FREE-low, POLIT-low and GOV-low countries indicate less environmental commitment at stronger statistical significance than the coefficients for the FREE-mid, POLIT-mid and GOVmid countries. In other words, clearly undemocratic countries exhibit even less environmental commitment than countries in the middle group, and we can be more certain that their commitment differs significantly from clear democracies than we can be for the group in between. This was to be expected, of course. In conclusion, this study provides a positive message: Democracies clearly show stronger environmental commitment than non-democracies. All other things being equal, therefore, a more democratic world will also be a world with stronger environmental commitment. This need not translate into better environmental outcomes, however, at least not immediately. Theory predicts a stronger link of democracy with environmental commitment than with outcomes. Gleditsch & Sverdrup (1996: 8) suspect this much when they write that ‘the crucial point is that regardless of what harm democracies may do to the environment, they are more likely to make corrective action’. As democracy spreads around the world, so will environmental commitment. More environmental commitment will help preventing environmental scarcities from leading to extreme outcomes like violent conflict. There is thus another avenue through which democracy can foster peace. This is not to say that democracies do not suffer from deficiencies and even failures with respect to environmental commitment. For example, future generations are affected by environmental degradation, but cannot express their preferences in the political market-place of the present. Environmental degradation cuts across national boundaries, which is likely to lead to excessive global environmental pollution in the absence of a central political authority (world government). Environmental degradation also cuts across administrative boundaries within nation-states, which renders policies successfully addressing these problems more difficult (Doeleman, 1997). But the point is that non-democracies equally suffer from these deficiencies, if not more. While democracy is less than perfect, there is no better alternative. Of course, democracy is not a static concept and it evolves over time. Some argue that the modern Western model of representative democracy with infrequent elections, substantial influence of lobby groups benefiting from environmental degradation, little mobilization of the people and limited participation outside well-defined and narrow boundaries is ill equipped to deal with long-term environmental problems and therefore needs to be transformed into a more ‘deliberative’ or ‘associative’ democracy (Lafferty & Meadowcroft, 1996; Doeleman, 1997). Addressing these issues is beyond the limits of this article, however, and is left to future research. Suffice it to say here that, again, while representative democracy might not be perfect, it is surely better than any non-democratic alternative.

#### Environmental destruction isn’t inevitable but it would cause extinction

Agence France-Presse, June 6, 2012 ¶ Environmental collapse now a serious threat: scientists¶ <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/06/06/environmental-collapse-now-a-serious-threat-scientists/>

Climate change, population growth and environmental destruction could cause a collapse of the ecosystem just a few generations from now, scientists warned on Wednesday in the journal Nature.¶ The paper by 22 top researchers said a “tipping point” by which the biosphere goes into swift and irreversible change, with potentially cataclysmic impacts for humans, could occur as early as this century.¶ The warning contrasts with a mainstream view among scientists that environmental collapse would be gradual and take centuries.¶ The study appears ahead of the June 20-22 UN Conference on Sustainable Development, the 20-year followup to the Earth Summit that set down priorities for protecting the environment.¶ The Nature paper, written by biologists, ecologists, geologists and palaeontologists from three continents, compared the biological impact of past episodes of global change with what is happening today.¶ The factors in today’s equation include a world population that is set to rise from seven billion to around 9.3 billion by mid-century and global warming that will outstrip the UN target of two degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit).¶ The team determined that once 50-90 percent of small-scale ecosystems become altered, the entire eco-web tips over into a new state, characterised especially by species extinctions.¶ Once the shift happens, it cannot be reversed.¶ To support today’s population, about 43 percent of Earth’s ice-free land surface is being used for farming or habitation, according to the study.¶ On current trends, the 50 percent mark will be reached by 2025, a point the scientists said is worryingly close to the tipping point.¶ If that happened, collapse would entail a shocking disruption for the world’s food supply, with bread-basket regions curtailed in their ability to grow corn, wheat, rice, fodder and other essential crops.¶ “It really will be a new world, biologically, at that point,” said lead author Anthony Barnosky, a professor of integrative biology at the University of California in Berkeley.¶ “The data suggests that there will be a reduction in biodiversity and severe impacts on much of what we depend on to sustain our quality of life, including, for example, fisheries, agriculture, forest products and clean water. This could happen within just a few generations.”¶ The authors stressed it was unclear when this feared tipover would happen, given blanks in knowledge about the phenomenon.¶ And they said there were plenty of solutions — such as ending unsustainable patterns of growth and resource waste — that mean it is not inevitable.

### \*\*\*1AC – Critical

#### The United States employs an outdated Cold War mentality to justify its continued isolation of Cuba. US Policy towards Cuba is a masked imperialism that frames Cubans as “stunted” and “underdeveloped” in order to impose its will upon their society, we have to recognize the silent racism that is running in the backdrop of US policy

**Schoultz 2010** (Lars Schoultz is the William Rand Kenan Jr. Professor of Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. “ Benevolent Domination,” Latin American and Caribbean Studies, Cuban Studies, Volume 41, Project Muse).

Benevolent Domination: The Ideology of U.S. Policy toward Cuba. Washington's hostile post–Cold War policy toward Cuba is often explained as a function of domestic politics—as an effort to curry favor among Cuban American voters and campaign contributors, most of whom live in Florida, which has the fourth-largest number of votes in the electoral college. Although it does not deny the significance of domestic politics, this article argues that the bedrock of U.S. policy is an ideology of benevolent domination. Created at the time of the Spanish-American War, President Theodore Roosevelt captured this ideology perfectly in 1907 when he explained, "I am seeking the very minimum of interference necessary to make them good," and it is seen today in the 2004 report of the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba. The United States and Cuba have not had normal diplomatic relations since January 3, 1961, eleven U.S. presidents ago. In contrast, the U.S. refusal to recognize both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China lasted for only five presidents, sixteen and twenty-two years, respectively. And the United States has not simply declined to have normal diplomatic relations with Havana: Washington has also spent most of the past half century in an open attempt to overthrow the island's government. There is nothing like Cuba in the history of United States foreign policy. This long-standing estrangement is the product of [End Page 1] several concrete concerns related to U.S. security, to U.S. economic interests, and to U.S. domestic politics. But underlying these concerns and governing the policies of the past eleven administrations is an ideology based above all else on a belief, widespread in the United States, that Cubans, like most Latin Americans, are a stunted branch of the human species. Our euphemism for these people and their societies is "underdeveloped."[1](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f1) This ideology is not a facade masking selfish interests and, in particular, a selfish interest in eliminating challenges to U.S. hegemony in the Caribbean. Rather, it is most useful to think of this ideology toward Latin America as the software Washington has created to take a keystroke from the environment—a revolution, for example—and process it through the policymaking computer and onto the monitor as policy. Working quietly in the background, this software is difficult to examine because it is politically incorrect to hint at its intellectual core: a firm belief that, in any hierarchy of peoples, Latin Americans are beneath the United States. Or as the minutes of a February 1959 National Security Council meeting have the CIA director warning: "Mr. Allen Dulles pointed out that the new Cuban officials had to be treated more or less like children. They had to be led rather than rebuffed. If they were rebuffed, like children, they were capable of doing almost anything." As one U.S. diplomat reported in the mid-nineteenth century, "Were it not for the civilizing influence of the United States, this country would by degrees revert to the aboriginal state in which Alvarado the Spaniard found it."[2](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f2) The best way to begin—but only begin—to explain U.S. policy toward revolutionary Cuba is not with this ideology, but with a frank recognition that senior U.S. officials are extremely busy, all but overwhelmed by an endless array of pressing issues, some of them matters of life and death; it would take both time and political capital to terminate today's complex embargo that has been cobbled together over half a century. Then, after acknowledging the importance of inertia, the next step is to observe that the United States has important interests to protect in Latin America, and the estrangement that began a half century ago was largely a response to the Cuban government's reluctance to address these interests to Washington's satisfaction. Correctly or incorrectly, wisely or unwisely, the United States came to perceive Cuba's revolutionary government as a threat to its interests.¶ For three of the past five decades, roughly from 1960 to 1990, the most important of these interests was to protect U.S. security. Although small Caribbean nations lack the power to threaten the United States, their territory can serve other major powers as a launching pad. And so the first statement of U.S. policy toward Latin America, the 1811 No-Transfer Resolution, was aimed to stop the British from securing a toehold in Spanish Florida, and the 1823 Monroe Doctrine was based on the same bedrock principle: prudent people keep potential adversaries as far away as possible, and Cuba is close. [End Page 2]¶ "We will bury you," Nikita Khrushchev boasted in 1956, just as Cuba's revolutionary leaders were planning their campaign to seize power.[3](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f3) Then in early 1960, a year after the rebels' victory, he sent the first deputy chair of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Anastas Mikoyan, to open a scientific, cultural, and technical exhibition in Havana. Before leaving the island, Mikoyan signed an agreement to purchase about 20 percent of Cuba's sugar crop for each of the following five years, and within three weeks, President Dwight Eisenhower had authorized preparation for the Bay of Pigs invasion. A Soviet-friendly government in Cuba was an unacceptable challenge to the primordial U.S. interest in security.¶ The Cuban Revolution also attacked substantial economic interests. The U.S. government lost some of its own property, principally Cuba's Nicaro nickel facility, which the U.S. General Services Administration had built during World War II; remaining U.S. government owned, it was operated by a private contractor, Freeport Sulphur Company, which had been developing is own nickel and cobalt mine at Moa Bay, forty miles to the east. Freeport lost that, too, and other U.S. investors suffered losses valued at about $2 billion at a time when a billion was more than pocket change. More than six thousand of those investors filed claims with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and some were extremely well-connected corporate leaders, such as Robert Kleberg, the president of King Ranch in Texas, which lost its forty-thousand-acre ranch in Cienfuegos. With help from his representative in Congress, the Senate majority leader Lyndon Johnson, Kleberg promptly marched into the Oval Office, demanded President Eisenhower's help, and got it—a full-court press by U.S. diplomats.¶ But most investors of Robert Kleberg's generation wrote off their losses decades ago, and in the post–Cold War era, they have been replaced by a new set of powerful economic interests seeking to reopen trade with the island. Agribusiness, the single most powerful lobbying force in Washington, has been key. It took U.S. farmers almost a decade, but in 2000, they finally pushed through a law that permits the sale of food to Cuba. At first Cuba declined to buy, insisting on normal two-way trade, but then it reconsidered after a devastating hurricane in 2001; and the year ended with a boatload of U.S. poultry sailing into Havana's harbor. It was the first significant trade with Cuba since 1963.¶ Cubans apparently liked what they bought, and soon the invisible hand of supply and demand—combined with low shipping costs—began to work its magic. In early 2002, six House Democrats visited the island, including the Arkansas moderate Vic Snyder, touting the rice and pork his constituents produced. Then came a delegation of California producers led by Senator Barbara Boxer, and a North Dakota delegation led by Republican governor John Hoeven followed her. The North Dakotans left Havana only hours before two more members of Congress arrived with a delegation featuring a former secretary of [End Page 3] agriculture, and this congressional delegation overlapped with a visit by Tampa's mayor Richard Greco, who was shepherding fifteen local business leaders hoping to convince Cubans to use their port for food shipments.¶ These visits were but a prelude to the main event in 2003: a privately organized food exhibition in Havana featuring 933 representatives of 288 U.S. vendors from thirty-three states and Puerto Rico, plus the agriculture commissioners from ten states, all eager to tap into the Cuban market. More than seventy U.S. firms signed more than $92 million in sales contracts, and North Carolina's agriculture commissioner drafted an op-ed article on her flight home: "With our economy on the skids, state budgets in shambles and our farmers going bankrupt, does it make any sense to continue a 40-year-old embargo with Cuba when there is so much to be gained by both countries? I don't think so." What was the result? In 2008, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that U.S. farmers had become "Cuba's largest supplier of food and agricultural products. Cuba has consistently ranked among the top ten export markets for U.S. soybean oil, dry peas, lentils, dry beans, rice, powdered milk and poultry. Cuba also has been a major market for U.S. corn, wheat and soybeans."[4](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f4)¶ So here we are, at a time when national security officials no longer have a significant interest in Cuba and economic interests are no longer a negative. Why does the estrangement continue? Enter the Cuban American community in Florida, which holds part—but only part—of the answer: a third interest, domestic politics or, more concretely, the interest politicians have in winning elections. As a former chief of the U.S. interests section pointed out in 2005: "Ninety-eight percent of U.S. citizens never think of Cuba; the only people who think Cuba is important are the Cubans in Miami."[5](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f5) No one would have paid these 1.2 million immigrants much attention if they had settled in Vermont, which has only three votes in the U.S. electoral college; but two-thirds chose to settle in booming Florida, which has twenty-seven votes, today's fourth-largest prize in the quadrennial electoral college sweepstakes, and after the 2010 census, Florida could move into a tie for third with New York, with twenty-nine (New York now has thirty-one but will likely lose two; Florida has twenty-seven and will probably gain two).¶ At first, Cuban immigrants were politically impotent, but soon they began to take out citizenship papers, and then in the 1970s, they started to elbow their way into politics, initially at the local level, where they competed for school boards and similar community councils. Then they set out to elect members of the state legislature, and they also started to form interest groups, capped in 1981 by the creation of the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF), which moved Cuban Americans up the political food chain to the national level. Primarily, CANF spoke for wealthy first-wave immigrants who were largely uninterested in the pork-barrel politics that typically characterize firstand second-generation immigrants; instead, CANF's goal was to influence U.S. [End Page 4] policy toward Cuba, and it did so the old-fashioned way, with campaign contributions and bloc voting.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f6)¶ And CANF did this at a propitious moment: it had spent the 1980s honing its political skills on legislation creating Radio and TV Martí. When the Cold War ended in the early 1990s, the foundation was a recognized force in Washington, perfectly positioned to move into the vacuum left by exiting national security officials. With its focus on tightening the embargo, CANF was responsible for both the 1992 Cuban Democracy (Torricelli) Act, passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Republican president, and then for initiating the campaign against third-country investors in Cuba that led to the Cuban Liberty and Democratic (LIBERTAD) Solidarity Act of 1996 (the Helms-Burton Act), passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Democratic president.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f7) Helms-Burton prompted the frustrated chief executive officer of the agribusiness heavyweight Archer Daniels Midland, eager to reopen an old market, to complain that "every presidential candidate is invited to Miami to make a speech to a handful of rich Cubans, and the candidate says, 'I will never speak to Castro.' The result is that we look to the rest of the world like idiots."[8](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f8)¶ Then came Elián González, the five-year-old boy found clinging to an inner tube off Fort Lauderdale on Thanksgiving Day in 1999. Since his mother had drowned after their rickety boat had capsized, and sending Elián back to live with a loving father in Cuba had been the right thing to do, President Bill Clinton wrote in his memoir: "I was still concerned that it could cost Al Gore Florida in November."[9](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f9) The charges of fraud in Florida's 2000 election were multiple and centered on the exclusion of more than fifty thousand African American voters, but anyone who had followed Elián's prolonged ordeal could reasonably conclude that his return had aroused intense anger in Little Havana. And although it is important not to overstate Cuban American voting clout, one thing is certain: when the dust settled in 2000, the Democrats had lost the state by 537 votes, handing all of Florida's electoral votes to the Republicans and giving George W. Bush the presidency with a five-vote electoral college margin.¶ Since then, the question has been: When will Cuban Americans begin to vote their broader interests—when will they cast their ballots and distribute their campaign contributions on some basis other than which party's candidates promise to be more vigorous in their hostility toward the government of the country from which they or their forebears emigrated? Much public opinion polling and the 2008 election, when Barack Obama captured about 35 percent of Cuban American votes, have suggested that significant dispersion is already occurring; but today's politicians are still walking a very thin line, as candidate Barack Obama's Miami speech to CANF illustrated in May 2008. While promising to maintain the embargo as leverage, he argued that "the United States must be a relentless advocate for democracy." Obama also promised to "immediately allow unlimited family travel and remittances to the island." [End Page 5]¶ When implemented in 2009, this relaxation of the embargo's travel and remittance provisions more than reversed a tightening in 2004, just before that year's election, when Cuban Americans were feeling neglected. In 2001, his first year as president, George W. Bush had presided over a May 20 Independence Day celebration with a party for Cuban American leaders on the White House lawn. The next year, 2002, was the hundredth anniversary of Cuban independence, and President Bush had flown to Miami to participate in the celebration. But in 2003, when the Iraq War had become a consuming focus, the president's Independence Day message had been nothing but a forty-second prerecorded restatement of what President Clinton had said a decade earlier: "My hope is for the Cuban people to soon enjoy the same freedoms and rights as we do." Then a few weeks later, the U.S. Coast Guard had intercepted a hijacked boat in the Straits of Florida and returned the hijackers to Cuba.¶ Enough is enough, wrote ninety-eight prominent Cuban Americans, taking out an ad in El Nuevo Herald on 3 August 2003, complaining in an open letter to the president that "current policy toward Cuba has not varied significantly from that of the previous administration." The Bush administration responded by creating the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba, chaired by Secretary of State Colin Powell. Published just before the nominating conventions in mid-2004, the commission's report recommended that President Bush tighten the embargo by reducing family visits and restricting remittances. These reductions and restrictions were not popular with many Cuban Americans, but they solidified the president's ultra-hard-line Cuban American base and probably contributed to his win in Florida.¶ Both George Bush and Barack Obama understood the importance of Florida's Cuban Americans, and both candidates' campaigns were guided by astute pollsters who in 2004 advised Bush to tighten the embargo but in 2008 advised Obama to relax it. The Democrats could not hope to attract the Republicans' hard-line base, but their polling indicted that a moderate Cuba policy was no longer an electoral death sentence among Cuban Americans. And the candidate's stand on Cuba was also important to many of the liberal Democrats who form that party's base. Walking an exceptionally thin line, Barack Obama promised to maintain the embargo but to lighten up on family visits and remittances. And he won Florida.¶ So where is U.S. policy heading? Given the torpor that has followed the Obama administration's April 2009 relaxation of restrictions on Cuban Americans, a safe hypothesis for the near term is that we may be heading toward a few more modest steps, albeit not to the full normalization of relations. But today's aging generation of Cuban revolutionaries and Cuban American counterrevolutionaries is clearly fading into the sunset. In time, the next generation of Cuban leaders will make changes on the island, and assessments of those[End Page 6] changes by the next generation of Cuban Americans will slowly diversify. At some point, the pollsters will tell everyone it is safe to end the estrangement.¶ The truly interesting question is what might come after that. No one knows, of course, but it may be instructive to look at a somewhat similar situation that occurred in the early 1990s, when the Soviet Union disappeared and when Cuba no longer had the resources to promote revolution abroad, especially in Central America, which had been one of Washington's consuming concerns throughout the 1980s. With national security interests no longer part of the policy debate, a reporter asked the first President Bush in 1991 if he intended to engage Fidel Castro as he had engaged Mikhail Gorbachev. "What's the point?" he replied. "All I'd tell him is what I'm telling you, to give the people the freedom that they want. And then you'll see the United States do exactly what we should: Go down and lift those people up."[10](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f10)¶ We should not make too much of this off-the-cuff response, but it suggests that something more than three pedestrian interests—security, economics, and domestic politics—underlies U.S. policy. It suggests the existence of a peculiar mind-set, a way of thinking about Cuba that may point to the direction of U.S. policy in the years immediately ahead. The foundation of this uplifting mindset is an obvious power disparity: the United States, unlike Cuba, is wealthy, and it has used a substantial portion of its wealth to create the most powerful military in the history of the human race. That raw power, in turn, has given politicians such as Richard Nixon the ability to tell voters that "the United States has the power, and Mr. Castro knows this, to throw him out of office," and it has given cabinet members such as Secretary of State Alexander Haig the ability to ask President Ronald Reagan for a simple green light: what he said to the President, according to Nancy Reagan, is: "You just give me the word and I'll turn that f——island into a parking lot."[11](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/cuban_studies/v041/41.schoultz.html" \l "f11)

#### And, the US embargo against Cuba is inhumane and a political tool of violence- it strips Cubans of basic life essentials

The Final Call [online news outlet]¶ Pope to U.S.: Lift Cuban embargo. February 3, 1998¶ <http://www.finalcall.com/international/cuba2-3-98.html>

Pope John Paul II, in his first visit ever to the island nation of Cuba, consistently delivered stinging condemnation of the U.S. embargo against the socialist country, calling the policy "oppressive, unjust and ethically unacceptable," and urged President Fidel Castro to open up his society. "A modern state cannot make atheism or religion one of its political ordinances," the pope told Mr. Castro.¶ In six separate addresses, Pope John Paul reiterated the themes of human rights, increased freedom for the church, the release of political prisoners, changes in Cuban social mores and Cuba's restoration to its proper place in the world. As he had throughout the pontiff's visit, the president shed his customary military fatigues for a blue suit.¶ On his departure from the country Jan. 25, the pope said, "imposed isolation strikes the people indiscriminately, making it ever more difficult for the weakest to enjoy the bare essentials of decent living, things such as food, health and education."¶ In recent months he has also criticized the U.S.-led sanctions against Muslim nations Libya and Iraq, hinting at visiting those countries.¶ The 77-year-old pontiff's comments join those of the Honorable Minister Louis Farrakhan, who has called international U.S.-led embargoes "weapons of mass destruction."¶ Others, including pastors, politicians, activists and a former U.S. military commander in the region, have said sanctions against Cuba are inhumane and need to end.

#### The US embargo on Cuba is an anti-humanitarian measure that the US imposes on Cuba at the expense of civilians in the name of profit and security interests. Strict secrecy standards enable the US to propagate starvation and poverty

Eaton 5-7-13 (Tracey Eaton, Havana Times, “USAID/Cuba, a Schizophrenic Policy”, http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=92675)

Keith Bolender writes in his 2012 book “Cuba Under Siege”:  “…There is ample evidence to suggest that America is enacting collective punishment on the people of Cuba with the intent of precipitating the overthrow of the socialist experiment…” Douglas Dillon, under secretary of state during the Kennedy administration, helped set the tone in 1960 when he said it was Washington’s duty to cause “rising discomfort among hungry Cubans.” The strategy continued in the 1970s, according to “Cuba Under Siege,” which quotes a CIA officer as saying: “We wanted to keep bread out of the stores so the people would go hungry.” Efforts to suffocate Cuba continue today. Yet while trying to squeeze the Cuban economy, American officials also allow Cuban-Americans to send more than $1 billion in remittances to their families every year. It’s a sensible humanitarian gesture, but it erodes the impact of the sanctions that U.S. officials so carefully enforce. Time passes and these contradictory measures remain in place, ever more ingrained, part of aninstitutionalized machinery that has cost American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. In February 2012, Desmond Butler of the Associated Press focused on one piece of that machinery – a USAID program that sent American Alan Gross to Cuba to set up a satellite Internet network. Butler’s [article](http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9SSHGPG2.htm) began: “Piece by piece, in backpacks and carry-on bags, American aid contractor Alan Gross made sure laptops, smartphones, hard drives and networking equipment were secreted into Cuba. The most sensitive item, according to official trip reports, was the last one: a specialized mobile phone chip that experts say is often used by the Pentagon and the CIA to make satellite signals virtually impossible to track.” Tom Paulson, a former reporter at the Seattle Post Intelligencer, wrote that the AP story added to an “ongoing discussion within the federal government about ‘re-inventing foreign aid.’” Paulson runs a website called [Humanosphere](http://www.humanosphere.org/), which analyzes the latest news in global health, development and poverty. He was strike by the AP’s claim that Gross was smuggling satellite telephone cards that aren’t available to the public and are “provided most frequently to the Defense Department and the CIA.”Paulson said U.S. officials said Gross “was just carrying out the normal mission of USAID.” He wrote: “Huh? This is the normal mission of USAID? This is certainly normal for the CIA, or those other branches of government legitimately set up to undermine authoritarian regimes around the world…. “But is it wise, and in our long-term interest, to be enlisting USAID in this cause as well?“Should the agency that was set up primarily to bring food to the starving, medical supplies to the injured or otherwise engage in America’s humanitarian causes overseas also be doing covert political work against hostile foreign governments? “Is there a need to more clearly delineate foreign aid from foreign policy?”Some countries have objected to USAID’s intrusions. Russia kicked out the agency in September 2012. On Wednesday, President Evo Morales announced that his government would expel USAID from Bolivia. USAID had operated in Bolivia since 1964. Juan Ramón Quintana, minister of the presidency, [said](http://www.presidencia.gob.bo/) today that the agency did not reduce poverty in the country. Instead, it directly interfered in Bolivian affairs from 1985 to 2005 and sought to maintain “political control” over Bolivia, Quintana said. “No one said anything” because ruling political parties benefitted from the “rain of dollars,” he said. “We have done rigorous research and what Bolivia should know is that the United States has not destined money for distribution to the poor, but rather to reserve its strategic interests outside its borders.” State Department spokesman Patrick Ventrell told reporters that Bolivia’s accusations were “baseless.” He said the agency’s goal was not political meddling, but “to help the Bolivian government improve the lives of ordinary Bolivians.” Whatever the case, Bolivia’s move was not a surprise. In June 2012, Bolivia along with Cuba, Ecuador, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Nicaragua and Venezuela signed a document calling for the expulsion of USAID from their borders. The document stated: “…USAID, through its different organizations and disguises, acts in an illegal manner with impunity, without possessing a legal framework to support this action, and illegally finances the media, political leaders and non-governmental organizations, among others.”

#### And, it’s important to consider the human factor in policy decisions- the embargo has real costs for the people of Cuba- it’s a form of systemic suffering

LARRY BIRNS [COHA-Council of Hemispheric Affairs- DIRECTOR]AND FREDERICK B. MILLS[COHA SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW ]¶ [Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now](http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)¶ –JANUARY 30, 2013¶ <http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/>

Besides being counter-productive, there are also strong moral arguments for ending the embargo. From a utilitarian point of view, the policy is objectionable because it has brought about needless suffering without convincing evidence of praiseworthy results. One illustration of this is what happened during what Havana calls the “special period in time of peace.” This refers to the economic crisis, hydrocarbon energy shortages, and food insecurity that followed the collapse of Soviet Bloc (1989 – 1991) which was Cuba’s main trading partner and the source of vital subsidies. The embargo took an especially harsh toll during the special period. According to a 1997 report Denial of Food and Medicine: The Impact of the Embargo on Health and Nutrition in Cuba by The American Association for World Health: “the U.S. embargo of Cuba has dramatically harmed the health and nutrition of large numbers of ordinary Cuban citizens.” The report also observed that “the U.S. embargo has caused a significant rise in suffering-and even deaths-in Cuba.” The special period, including a serious food shortage in 1993, did not lead to the country’s surrender, but to the decisive restructuring of the agricultural sector, a number of economic reforms, and the diversification of trade.¶ A more recent report by Human Rights Watch also points to the needless suffering caused by the embargo:¶ “The United States’ economic embargo on Cuba, in place for more than half a century, continues to impose indiscriminate hardship on Cubans, and has failed to improve human rights in the country.” (2012 Report on Cuba)

#### Thus, my partner and I are resolved that: The United States federal government should end its embargo against Cuba.

#### The embargo is a form of oppression, the plan addresses our complicity and the complicity of the US government in exporting suffering to the Cuban people

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

7. It's inhumane. If strategic arguments don't persuade you that it's time to end the embargo, then perhaps humanitarian arguments will. For as anyone who's traveled to the island knows, there's a decidedly enclave-like feel to those areas of the economy where capitalism has been allowed to flourish in a limited sense (e.g. tourism) and the rest of the island, which feels very much like the remnant of an exhausted socialist economic model. When I went there in the 1990s with my sister, I remember the throngs of men who would cluster outside the tourist haunts. They'd hope to persuade visitors like me to pretend to be their escort so they could sneak into the fancier hotels and nightclubs, which they could not enter otherwise. Horse -- yes, horse -- was a common offering on menus back then. That situation has apparently eased in recent years as the government has opened up more sectors of the economy to ordinary Cubans. But the [selective nature of that deregulation](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~jidoming/images/jid_hello.pdf) has only exacerbated economic inequalities. Again, one can argue that the problem here is one of poor domestic policy choices, rather than the embargo. But it's not clear that ordinary Cubans perceive that distinction. Moreover, when you stand in the airport and watch tourists disembark with bucket-loads of basic medical supplies, which they promptly hand over to their (native) friends and family, it's hard not to feel that U.S. policy is perpetuating an injustice.

#### Removing the embargo solves – the blockade functions as a shield for political leaders and an alibi for strategic interests to justify any action, even actions at the expense of the people.

Rodriguez 5-8-2013 (Yusimí Rodríguez, Havana Times, “Who Profits from the Cuba Blockade?”, <http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=92722>)

It’s hard to determine, with any degree of exactitude, to what extent the blockade, sorry, the embargo…heck, the blockade, affects the lives of the Cuban people. What I do know is that, while it is still around, this blockade, or embargo, or whatever you want to call it, will continue to be guilty of all our problems, of everything that doesn’t quite work, of all the mistakes made by our leaders. So, I again ask myself: who stands to benefit from the blockade? Who continue to use it as a pretext for the failure of the economic model they now seek to modernize? Who will continue to repress and discredit those who oppose the government, claiming that they are at the service of a foreign power? Who truly profits from the petition made by the Ladies in White?

#### Even Cuban dissidents have begun to support ending the embargo, the 1AC is a recognition that US policy is perpetuating inequality and poverty amongst the Cuban people

JAMILA AISHA BROWN ¶ Jamila Aisha Brown [a social entrepreneur, freelance writer, and political commentator. She is the founder of HUE, LLC, a progressive consultancy specializing in community-led projects and initiatives in the African diaspora]¶ Top of Form ¶ April 16, 2013 FOREIGN POLICY, POP CULTURE¶ El Momento Es Ahora –End the Cuban Embargo Now¶ http://www.cbcfinc.org/thevillage/?p=297

The Carters, rapper/mogul Jay-Z and his wife Beyoncé, found themselves caught in an international controversy after vacationing on the communist island of Cuba for their fifth wedding anniversary.¶ Rumors and allegations swarmed the couple’s visit as photos were released of the two touring the sites of Old Havana. Were they guests of the Castros? Was their trip sending the wrong message? Did they acquire the necessary travel visas from the U.S. Treasury Department?¶ Amid outcry and outrage heard across the nation, the denouncement from Cuban Americans rang loudly. Travel to Cuba by American citizens being a federal offense, Republican Florida representatives Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Mario Diaz-Balart issued a [letter](http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/04/06/lawmakers-ask-why-beyonce-and-jay-z-went-to-cuba/?hpt=hp_t2) of investigation into the couple’s visit to the communist nation.¶ Jay-Z true to his battle rap roots, voiced his [response](https://soundcloud.com/jperiod/jay-z-f-common-open-letter?utm_source=soundcloud&utm_campaign=wtshare&utm_medium=Facebook&utm_content=http%3A%2F%2Fsoundcloud.com%2Fjperiod%2Fjay-z-f-common-open-letter) to critics over a Swizz Beatz and Timbaland produced track:¶ “This communist talk is so confusing/When it’s from China, the very mic that I’m using”¶ While the moment could be dismissed as a celebrity gaffe and yet another diss track to be easily forgotten in the annals of celebrity pop culture, it provides an opportunity for lawmakers and citizens alike to revisit the United States’ 51-year-old economic embargo against the Republic of Cuba.¶ The [embargo](http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/04/14/has-the-us-embargo-against-cuba-failed/) stands as one of the last remaining vestiges of American Cold War policies. Despite the fall of the Soviet Union and Fidel Castro’s advanced age and illness forcing him to relinquish leadership to his younger brother Raúl, the regime still stands. Sanctions have neither quelled human rights abuses nor coerced the communist country into embracing democracy and are [widely](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/13/us-cuba-embargo-un-idUSBRE8AC11820121113) condemned as a failure of U.S. foreign policy.¶ Even Cubans in opposition to the communist government, among them dissident blogger [Yoani Sánchez](http://www.nytimes.com/video/2013/03/22/world/americas/100000002133249/cuban-dissident-calls-to-end-embargo.html), support an end to the U.S. embargo against Cuba saying the embargo is “anti-Cuban and not anti-Castro.”¶ When I traveled to Cuba in 2010 with the US Women and Cuba Collaboration to meet with Afro-Cuban women to discuss [gender and racial equality](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=otMtIGc8t8U), signs of the embargo were evident even before arriving at our destination. Cuban-American families brought with them an abundance of “gifts” for their relatives mainly clothing and household items many of us take for granted. On the island itself universal healthcare is juxtaposed by the lack of access to high-quality medical equipment and medicines (most of which carry U.S. patents and therefore are prohibited) and the benefit of free education comes at a cost of limited school supplies.¶ American policy is not only aberrant in comparison to the rest of the world that regularly trades with Cuba, but it highlights the stark contradictions in U.S. foreign policy.¶ As Jay-Z rhymed, the United States has normalized, albeit at times contentious, relations with communist China. Moreover, its vow to penalize Cuba for its humanitarian record brings into question its relationship with other noted oppressive regimes such as Saudi Arabia and Bahrain whom the American government counts as close allies.¶ After five decades the US-Cuban embargo has only succeeded in pushing residents of the island deeper into poverty and with American economic constraints unable to sway Cuban political will, it is time for a new approach to Cuba. While visiting a school in Matanzas, Cuba that trains students to become art, music, and dance teachers in efforts to preserve Cuban culture, I was struck by the talent of this singer and composer who performed his song “El Momento Es Ahora” (The Moment Is Now). Indeed it is.

#### The history of Cuban/ US relations is one of securitization and falsely constructed epistemology. Cuba was used as the laboratory where US imperialism was “perfected” before being exported globally. The 1AC is a critical challenge to the way imperial thinking pervades US policy

Louis A. Pérez Jr. [J. Carlyle Sitterson Professor of History at University of North Carolina; Editor, Cuban Journal-M.A. University of Arizona,Ph.D. University of New Mexico] 2008¶ Cuba In the American Imagination-Metaphor and the Imperial Ethos [book, online]¶ Pp 1-11

Cuba occupies a special place in the history of American imperialism. It¶ has served as something of a laboratory for the development of the methods¶ by which the United States has pursued the creation of a global empire. In the¶ aggregate, the means used by the United States in Cuba constitute a microcosm¶ of the American imperial experience: armed intervention and military¶ occupation; nation building and constitution writing; capital penetration and¶ cultural saturation; the installation of puppet regimes, the formation of clientele¶ political classes, and the organization of proxy armies; the imposition of¶ binding treaties; the establishment of a permanent military base; economic¶ assistance—or not—and diplomatic recognition—or not—as circumstances¶ warranted. And after 1959, trade sanctions, political isolation, covert operations,¶ and economic embargo. All that is American imperialism has been practiced¶ in Cuba.¶ But it is also true that, for all the ways that Cuba stands as an embodiment¶ of American imperial practice, it is at the same time different—so different, in¶ fact, that it must be considered as a case apart. Cuba seized hold of the North¶ American imagination early in the nineteenth century. What made awareness¶ of Cuba particularly significant were the ways that it acted on the formation of¶ the American consciousness of nationhood. The destiny of the nation seemed¶ inextricably bound to the fate of the island. It was impossible to imagine the¶ former without attention to the latter.¶ All through the nineteenth century, the Americans brooded over the¶ anomaly that was Cuba: imagined as within sight, but seen as beyond reach;¶ vital to the national interest of the United States, but in the possession of Spain.¶ To imagine Cuba as indispensable to the national well-being was to make possession¶ of the island a necessity. The proposition of necessity itself assumed¶ something of a self-fulfilling prophesy, akin to a prophetic logic that could¶ not be explained in any way other than a matter of destiny. The security and¶ perhaps—many insisted—even the very survival of the North American Union¶ seemed to depend on the acquisition of Cuba. The men and women who gave¶ thought to affairs of state, as elected leaders and appointed officials; as newspaper¶ editors and magazine publishers; as entrepreneurs, industrialists, and¶ investors; as poets and playwrights; as lyricists, journalists, and novelists; and¶ an ever-expanding electorate—almost all who contemplated the future well¶ being of the nation were persuaded that possession of Cuba was a matter of¶ national necessity.¶ Not everyone agreed, of course. It was with a sense of exasperation that¶ Vermont senator Jacob Collamer protested in 1859 that “the idea that the possession¶ of Cuba is necessary to the actual existence of this country, is a mere¶ figment of the imagination.”1 But that was exactly the point: the conventionally¶ wise were indeed persuaded that possession of Cuba was indispensable to¶ the “actual existence” of the United States. And, as will be argued in the pages¶ that follow, precisely because Cuba revealed itself as a “figment of the imagination,”¶ the island inscribed itself deeply into the very certainties by which¶ Americans arrived at a sense of themselves as a nationality and as a nation.¶ Years ago Ronald Steel suggested the possibility that “the American empire¶ came into being without the intention or the knowledge of the American¶ people.”2 Many would disagree, certainly, but there is a kind of truth in¶ Steel’s observation, one that engages the very ways that Americans imagined¶ the world at large and acted within the scope of their imagination. All through¶ the nineteenth century, and into the twentieth, Americans were preoccupied¶ with two overriding concerns: self-interests and self-representation. It was to¶ be the genius of U.S. imperialism that the Americans learned to conflate the¶ two into an imperial narrative of remarkable endurance. They embarked upon¶ empire by way of self-deception and self-delusion, through an idiom of denial¶ as a means of disavowal. Perhaps it was simply easier that way: a polity and its¶ political leaders in collusion to spare each other the truth of their purpose.¶ This book will argue that the U.S. experience with Cuba had a defining impact¶ on the sense of purpose with which the Americans would project their¶ power abroad: to be more specific, that Cuba contributed to shaping the normative¶ determinants by which the Americans fixed their place and defined¶ their purpose in the world, attributes that were subsequently transmuted into¶ the very moral logic of the U.S. imperial project.¶ Certainly this had to do with Americans thinking highly of themselves, but¶ it also had to do with an abiding concern to be thought well of by others. Indeed,¶ both were vital to the ways that the Americans came to define and defend¶ their claim to Cuba. The American way to imperialism was inscribed within¶ cultural forms as sources of usable modes of knowledge and deployed by way¶ of metaphorical constructs as usable models of conduct. Cuba entered the¶ American imagination early in the nineteenth century principally by way of¶ metaphor: depictions fashioned as a function of self-interest, almost always in¶ the form of moral imperative in which the exercise of power was represented¶ as the performance of beneficence. It is not that the metaphorical motifs the¶ Americans used to represent Cuba were necessarily original or unique to the¶ United States. On the contrary, the vernacular of empire reaches deeply into¶ the history of colonial narratives. What was different about Cuba, and what¶ will be argued in the pages that follow, was the prominence of metaphor as a¶ mode of North American discourse, which is to say, the prominence of metaphor¶ in the production of knowledge. What was different about Cuba was the¶ degree to which metaphor so utterly displaced alternative cognitive possibilities.¶ Virtually all the metaphors in the stock of imperial tropes were fully aggregated¶ into a single narrative of remarkable endurance—itself evidence of¶ the power of the pathology that was Cuba.¶ To grasp the meaning of metaphor as the principal mode of the North¶ American engagement with Cuba is to understand both the moral forms by¶ which power was transacted and the ideological context in which purpose was¶ articulated. Simply put, metaphor served as an efficacious means with which¶ to advance North American interests. The narratives were typically inscribed¶ within ordinary and commonplace formulations of cultural models, those patterns¶ of practice by which Americans themselves experienced daily life: where¶ the premise of power assumed the appearance of self-evident propriety, sustained¶ as a circumstance of self-explanatory logic.¶ To contemplate the use of metaphor is to appreciate the capacity of figurative¶ language to shape the moral logic of power as a normative phenomenon.¶ The purpose of metaphor was not explicitly political. Rather, its principal¶ activity was the creation of a fictive world in which the propriety of power¶ obtained depictive efficacy as a cultural condition. The exercise of power was¶ represented as a function not of political ends but of moral ones.¶ This book examines the cultural context of political purpose, not only as a¶ frame of reference, but, more important, as a way to understand the dialectical¶ process by which culture validated the use of power as a matter of commonsense¶ normality and commonplace propriety. The premise of power assumed¶ the form of disinterested purport and obtained plausibility as a matter of cultural¶ practice. To have deployed metaphor as a mode of cognitive engagement¶ was to conceal the purpose of power, specifically, to represent the defense of¶ self-interest as a gesture of selfless intent.¶ The use of metaphor did not necessarily imply mischievous intent. Nor was¶ it about behaving knowingly and knowing better in an act of dissimulation.¶ There is in fact something of an authenticity to metaphor in the sense that its¶ use implies a spontaneous recourse to imagery to construct a version of reality.¶ But that spontaneity must itself be understood to possess a history, socially¶ determined and culturally fixed. To engage the logic of metaphor is to gain¶ access to the normative sources of power.¶ It is perhaps impossible to take the full measure of the character of public¶ support accorded to the imperial project. It was sometimes active; at other¶ times, passive. At least as often it was a matter of indifferent acquiescence. Perhaps,¶ as Steel suggested, Americans did not even know that an empire existed.¶ But if Steel was only partially correct, it would be a remarkable corroboration¶ of the discursive capacity of self-representation to conceal the existence of empire¶ from the imperial body politic. It also raises complicated issues bearing¶ on the pathology of power and, more specifically, the capacity of Americans¶ to propound—and persuade themselves of—purpose utterly unconnected to¶ practice.¶ The analysis of the relationship between language and power necessarily¶ involves the examination of the ways that metaphor produced knowledge and¶ thereupon enabled power to shape a consensus about the nature of reality.¶ This is, as historian Michael Hunt has persuasively suggested, on one hand,¶ to take stock of “the need for greater sensitivity to language and especially to¶ the meaning embedded in key words” and, on the other, “to look beneath the¶ explicit meanings texts convey to the deeper structures of language and rhetoric¶ that both impart and circumscribe meaning.”3¶ Americans embraced imperialism principally by way of an accumulated¶ stock of metaphorical constructs, mostly as a set of figurative depictions arranged¶ in the form of a narrative to represent national purpose. This was metaphor¶ as the principal means through which a people persuaded themselves of¶ the beneficence of their purpose and the propriety of their conduct, that is, the¶ wherewithal to sustain the self-confidence and moral certainty so central to¶ the maintenance of systems of domination. The ideological function of metaphor¶ was contained in its use as a source of normative truths, to represent the¶ exercise of North American power as a matter of moral purpose.¶ For almost all of the nineteenth century, the Americans stood vigil over¶ the future of Cuba. The perception of Cuba as profoundly relevant to North¶ American well-being meant that almost everything that happened on the¶ island somehow implicated U.S. interests. Certainly the Americans thought¶ so. And on the matter of the future of sovereignty over Cuba, the Americans¶ were as unequivocal as they were unyielding. “The American Government,”¶ U.S. minister to Spain Alexander Everett pronounced as early as 1825, “could¶ not consent to any change in the political situation of Cuba other than one¶ which should place it under the jurisdiction of the United States.”⁴ This meant¶ first and foremost, of course, the determination to prevent the transfer of¶ Cuba from Spain to any other European power. But it also meant opposition¶ to the succession of sovereignty of Cuba by the Cubans. First during the years¶ 1868–78 and 1879–80, but especially 1895–98, Cubans embarked upon wars of¶ liberation explicitly with the objective of seizing control of their own future.¶ These were popular mobilizations, imbued with a sense of destiny radically¶ different from what the Americans had imagined for Cuba. The Cuban independence¶ war of 1895–98 in particular challenged North American designs on¶ Cuba’s future, and indeed in 1898—in what subsequently passed into U.S. history¶ books as the “Spanish-American War”—the Americans acted in defense¶ of their interests.¶ The consequences of the U.S. intervention were far-reaching and complex¶ and assumed many forms. The claim to have committed to war in 1898 in behalf¶ of Cuba was subsequently celebrated as acting on those qualities that¶ Americans most admired about themselves: support for Cuban liberty and¶ sympathy for Cuban suffering, from which developed easily enough the disposition¶ to propound the defense of freedom as a matter of discharge of amour¶ propre, and eventually the conviction that righteous motive and moral purpose¶ were sufficiently compelling reasons to deploy power as a means of selffulfillment.¶ The perception of the “Spanish-American War” as—in the words of Nelson¶ Miles, the commanding general of the army in 1898—“America’s war for¶ humanity”⁵ was commonly shared and widely held at the time and passed¶ fully into realms of received wisdom. That American political leaders and military¶ planners in 1898 prosecuted the war as a matter of disinterested purpose¶ is, however, far less certain. The men charged with decision-making authority¶ were eminently conscious of the strategic implications of war, and especially¶ of the degree to which control of Cuba involved issues of vital national interests.¶ To ignore recourse to war in 1898 as a matter of realpolitik—Carl von¶ Clausewitz’s war as the “continuation of politics by other means”—is to disregard¶ the meaning of nearly a century of fixed North American purpose the¶ singular objective of which was control of Cuba.¶ There is no gainsaying, however, that popular belief in the deployment of¶ power as a matter of moral discharge gained discursive ascendancy in the narratives¶ of the national purpose in 1898. Few Americans then—or thereafter—¶ would have disagreed with Secretary of War William Howard Taft’s characterization¶ that the United States had been inspired in 1898 by “pure altruism,”¶ and “that the real ground for the war was the sympathy that the Americans¶ had with a people struggling against an oppressive and misguided rule.”⁶ No¶ one at the time seemed to doubt the generosity of purpose that was 1898. The¶ pronouncement of essayist A. D. Hall captured the sense and essence of the¶ emerging popular consensus on the meaning of the war:¶ If ever there was a war that was entered into purely from motives of humanity¶ and with no thought whatever of conquest, it is this one. The entire people¶ of the United States were agreed that their purpose was a holy one. . . .¶ War is justifiable, when waged, as the present one unquestionably is, for¶ purely unselfish motives, simply from a determination to rescue a people¶ whose sufferings had become unbearable to them and to the lookers-on.¶ The United States, by its action, has set a lesson for the rest of the world,¶ which the latter will not be slow to learn and for which future generations¶ will bless the name of America.⁷¶ The view of 1898 as an undertaking for humanity served to fix the moral¶ calculus by which the Americans thereafter imagined the purpose of their¶ power and celebrated the virtue of their motives. The war produced a “decisive¶ change in the consciousness of the Americans themselves,” pronounced¶ historian Archibald Cary Coolidge ten years after the end of the conflict, who¶ thereupon concluded that they were “called upon to play a part in the broader¶ affairs of mankind.”⁸¶ The proposition of power exercised as generous purpose was celebrated¶ as an attribute of character—national character, to be precise: what made¶ Americans American. This was to act out self-identified attributes of national¶ character both as means of internal consensus and mode of international conduct:¶ more specifically, as cultural source of a foreign policy in which selfproclaimed¶ national virtues served as the principal formulation with which¶ to propound national interests. Prior to 1898, historian Norman Graebner discerned,¶ “the foreign policies of the United States were rendered solvent by¶ ample power to cover limited, largely hemispheric, goals.” Everything changed¶ after 1898: “By contrast, moral purpose embodied in the quest for universal¶ peace, democracy, and justice, operating in a supposedly rational world, created¶ endless expectations among those who claimed the selfless obligation¶ to serve mankind. After 1900 the country’s official phraseology gradually embraced¶ global abstract objectives which no traditional power could achieve.”⁹¶ The claim of generosity of purpose as motive and the sacrifice of life and¶ treasure as means subsequently developed into the principal discursive rep¶ resentation by which the Americans advanced their interests in the world at¶ large. These notions must be viewed as the formative pronouncements of the¶ American purpose abroad. They suggest in form and function a creation myth,¶ that is, the “birth” of a new international entity, charged with salvation of the¶ world. The rationale of American imperialism was inscribed in a master narrative¶ that propounded unabashedly a stance of moral superiority: Americans¶ given to selfless service to mankind, without ulterior motive, without selfish¶ intent. The formidable power of the United States, Americans persuaded¶ themselves, would be placed at the service of the well-being of humanity. The¶ logic of this conviction served to shape the dominant ideological formations¶ of the twentieth century.¶ Precisely because the pursuit of national interest was imagined as enactment¶ of moral purpose, the Americans could plausibly demand the world to¶ acquiesce to the purity of their motives. Having persuaded themselves that they¶ acted entirely out of disinterested motive and selfless intent, in the service of¶ humanity, as agents of order, progress, and liberty, they concluded that other¶ people had no cause to doubt their intentions or oppose their policies. Power¶ thus exercised with the certainty of beneficent purpose could not readily admit¶ the plausibility of opposition. Indeed, to oppose noble intent could only suggest¶ ignoble motive. Those who would challenge the authenticity of American¶ altruism, those who opposed the goals of American generosity, were necessarily¶ evildoers and mischief-makers, misinformed or else malcontents given¶ to doing bad things, and by definition deemed to be enemies of humanity. So¶ fully were Americans in the thrall of the moral propriety of their own motives¶ as to be unable to recognize the havoc their actions often wrought on the lives¶ of others.¶ The Americans thus assigned themselves the role of a moral force in defense¶ of those inalienable rights with which they had invented themselves.¶ The undertaking was assumed as a duty of destiny—as a matter of providential¶ design—celebrated in hymns and prayer, in song and poetry as well as fiction¶ and film, in political discourse and historical scholarship. Men and women¶ both of means and of modest social origins; essayists, poets, and lyricists; civic¶ associations and women’s organizations—all in varying degrees and at different¶ times, by way of aesthetic production and scientific pronouncements,¶ as religious conviction and philosophical musings—contributed to the moral¶ environment in which imperialism flourished.¶ The proposition of beneficent intent and benign motive in defense of freedom¶ and liberty in the world at large, very much derived from the experience¶ of 1898, served to ascribe moral purpose to political conduct. It was a powerful¶ self-confirming proposition, from which to defend empire as a matter of prin¶ ciple and expand power as a defense of virtue. The notion resonated as a public¶ discourse. The felicity of the imagery sat well with the popular imagination,¶ disposed to celebrate its virtues, and especially when those virtues constituted¶ the principal attributes of a nation new in the history of the world. Americans¶ were smitten by their self-constructed selves: a people providentially chosen¶ to bring light to a dark world. “We have expanded into an empire,” exulted¶ naval analyst H. C. Taylor in 1899, “and are now the imperial republic of the¶ world. . . . Plans for the future must be made by minds willing to acknowledge¶ that imperial resources may be needed to preserve these possessions that have¶ fallen to us, to protect their feeble peoples, and to aid them in the their efforts¶ to secure a political happiness and freedom hitherto denied them.”1⁰ Those¶ who opposed the imperial project, scoffed Indiana senator Albert Beveridge¶ the following year, were “either insincere, or else unbelievers in the soundness¶ of American institutions, the purity of the American heart, and the noble intention¶ of the American mind.”11 President William McKinley rebuked critics¶ who opposed imperialism for having “no confidence in the virtue or capacity¶ or high purpose or good faith of this free people as a civilizing agency.”12 Certainty¶ of purpose was always more important than consideration of consequences. ¶ This was foreign policy propounded explicitly as a faith in national¶ character, where motive mattered more than means and outcomes mattered¶ less than intentions. This was the making of the American sublime.¶ The proposition of discharge of moral duty as enactment of national character¶ in 1898 imbued Americans with a sense of righteous purpose. Woodrow¶ Wilson was among the many Americans deeply moved by the moral use of¶ power abroad as a means of political coercion. The future president himself¶ would later propound a foreign policy very much derived from the moral purpose¶ of power associated with the intervention in Cuba in 1898.13 Indeed, no¶ president did more to define the purpose of American power as a matter of¶ moral responsibility and righteous duty than Woodrow Wilson. Writing even¶ as the war of 1898 was still in progress, Wilson celebrated the intervention in¶ Cuba as “an impulse of humane indignation and pity—because we saw at our¶ very doors a government unmindful of justice or of mercy, contemptuous in its¶ every practice of the principles we professed to live for.”1⁴ Reflecting later on¶ 1898 in his History of the American People (1902), Wilson imagined the war in behalf¶ of Cuba as an expression of the noblest instincts of the American people:¶ “It was a war of impulse,” he repeated. Writing the history of a period through¶ which he himself had lived, Wilson wrote with moral certitude: “Intervention had come, not for the material aggrandizement of the United States, but for¶ the assertion of the right of the government to succor those who seemed hopelessly¶ oppressed.”1⁵ The propriety of power in behalf of beneficent purpose, Wilson insisted, constituted the principal virtue of U.S. foreign policy. “We¶ [are] the apostles of liberty and of self-government,” he proclaimed. “We have¶ given pledges to the world and must redeem them as we can.” The “very principles¶ of life” and “sense of identity” were derived from the new place of the¶ United States in the world: “to serve, not subdue the world.” Concluded Wilson,¶ “No war ever transformed us quite as the war with Spain transformed us.¶ No previous years ever ran with so swift a change as the years since 1898. We¶ have witnessed a new revolution. We have seen the transformation of America¶ completed.”1⁶¶ Belief in moral discharge as national purpose developed into an enduring¶ legacy of 1898 and passed into the master narrative of historical scholarship.¶ The historiography developed into another site for self-confirmation of¶ national virtue, and through much of the twentieth century historians engaged¶ unabashedly in a celebration of the selfless magnanimity with which¶ the United States went to war in 1898 and subsequently attended to the wellbeing¶ of the world at large. This was a narrative point of reference, a framework¶ through which the historiography acted to set the limits to the historical¶ and in the process established its affinity to the political. Journalist, historian,¶ and later Michigan senator Arthur Vandenberg gave early voice to what was to develop into a salient tenet of American historiography. The American intervention¶ in Cuba was “one of the loftiest purposed acts in the history of civilization,”¶ Vandenberg exulted in 1926, one that complimented “the altruism¶ of a nation which . . . is prepared to serve human-kind in its own way and on¶ its own initiative with a purity of dedication unmatched in any other government¶ on earth.”1⁷ This perspective held sway through much of the twentieth¶ century. “Peoples of primitive or retarded cultures,” Julius Pratt wrote in 1950,¶ “thrust into the currents of advanced international politics and economics,¶ may need guardians to guide and direct their development and to give them¶ government and protection while they learn to care for themselves in the modern¶ world,” and to the point, “those who have fallen under the guardianship of¶ the United States have fared well in the main. . . . American imperialism has,¶ on the whole, been benevolent.”1⁸ The rise of the United States “toward world¶ power and participation in international events,” historian H. Wayne Morgan¶ repeated the received wisdom of 1898 fifteen years later, “carried in it potent¶ ideas and ideals that captured the allegiance of most Americans. It promised¶ to carry the dream of freedom to all the corners of the world. . . . It fed pride¶ in America’s greatness [and] in the goodness of her institutions. . . . Honest¶ indignation at the thought of misery in other lands, and the earnest desire to end cruelty and oppression, fortified the general public’s belief in the American¶ mission.”1⁹The meaning of 1898 played deeply into the ways that Americans constructed¶ a sense of themselves and their place in the world. The war that the¶ Cubans inaugurated in 1895 and into which the Americans inserted themselves¶ in 1898 served as the occasion in which the idea of moral conduct was¶ first enacted as rationale for the exercise of U.S. power overseas, subsequently¶ to shape the terms by which the Americans represented themselves at home¶ and abroad. As historian Paul McCartney has correctly suggested, the war of¶ 1898 contributed in “decisive ways to the development of American national¶ identity.”2⁰ Much changed after 1898.¶ 􀂐􀀃􀂐􀀃􀂐¶ The place of Cuba in this transformation was decisive. Empire came easily¶ to the Americans in 1898, in part because it was not all their own doing. In¶ fact, they received vital assistance from the Cubans. For more than three years,¶ Cuban insurgent armies had effectively battled Spain, at a frightful cost to¶ themselves, of course, but with desolating effect on the Spanish army and the¶ Spanish treasury. The Cubans had brought the Spanish ever closer to defeat,¶ whereupon the Americans intervened and claimed the victory. Cubans played a¶ decisive part as unwitting allies of American imperialism, enabling the Americans to launch a global empire at comparatively small cost to life and treasure.¶ “It is to [the Cubans’] ragged army,” the New York Journal would acknowledge¶ only weeks after the conclusion of the war, “that we owe the acquisition of¶ Porto Rico, the Philippines and all the glory that our troops have garnered in¶ this war. If it had not been for their unconquerable spirit we should never have¶ interfered in Spain’s colonial affairs, and the curtain that is rising on our new¶ destiny would have stayed down.”21 That the Cubans were, as it happened, also¶ among the first people to fall victim to the North American imperial sway was¶ an outcome of no small irony. The Cuban war to end one empire precipitated¶ an American war that begat another. Beyond facilitating the U.S. military defeat of Spain, however, the Cubans¶ also contributed—unknowingly—to enhancing the North American sense of¶ self-righteous hubris. The ease of victory served to confirm the American certainty¶ of destiny, and thereupon to consecrate the sense of moral purpose and¶ to increase the military confidence with which the United States subsequently¶ engaged the world.22 The narrative certainty was set in place early—and endured,¶ certainly in the popular imagination. Its origins came naturally enough¶ from success in war, and quickly the celebration of victory developed into the¶ exaltation of the victors. President William McKinley set the tone early as he¶ heaped praised on “the heroes of Santiago,” who distinguished themselves in¶ a war “unequaled in its completeness and the quick succession with which victory followed victory,” and added, “Our troops sailed to Cuba and achieved a¶ glorious triumph.” He was exultant as he celebrated the victories at “Santiago,¶ the charge of San Juan hill and El Caney,” the “intrepid valor and determination¶ of our gallant troops,” in short, all the qualities that made U.S. military¶ forces “illustrious and invincible.”23 That Cubans were party to and part of the¶ “glorious triumph” passed unacknowledged.¶ The war of 1898 as the first postbellum national war effort—North and South¶ together in a common cause against an overseas adversary—fixed permanently¶ how Americans came to think of themselves: a righteous people given to the¶ service of righteous purpose. These sentiments did not originate with 1898, of¶ course. They were in fact deeply inscribed in the national myth. But the belief¶ in an exalted manifest destiny as a matter of a logic for an international presence¶ was confirmed in 1898, in what the Americans understood as a victory¶ achieved—unaided—with such ease and complete success. The empire that¶ followed was providential, proof that Americans had been called upon to discharge¶ their duty to mankind. “In the providence of God,” President William¶ McKinley proclaimed in 1899, “who works in mysterious ways, this [territory]¶ was put into our lap, and the American people never shirk duty.”2⁴ The idea of¶ humanitarian mission served as a source of enduring moral subsidy throughout the twentieth century and beyond, as a means of self-representation and a¶ mode of representation to others. The people who readily endorsed the proposition¶ of beneficent duty as motive for armed intervention in Cuba in 1898¶ would henceforth exercise power abroad as duty of beneficence. It was the¶ American way.

**Prioritize the macro ethical stance of the 1AC over the incremental micro focus of the Neg’s Cps and Disads, the debate should be about crafting ethical responses in the face of suffering not what is politically expedient**

Tony Smith [International & Comparative Politics Cornelia M. Jackson Professor of Political Science Ph.D., Harvard University, 1971]¶ Tufts University¶ Patrick J. Haney and Walt Vanderbush, The Cuban Embargo: The Domestic Politics of an American Foreign Policy.Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005. 222 pp.¶ Journal of Cold War Studies 9.4 (2007) 140-142 [Project Muse]

What is lacking finally is a sense of the passion of ethnic politics. One may regret (as this reviewer does and as the authors of this book apparently do too) that ethnic communities becomes so committed to their causes that they let common sense fly to the winds in the pursuit of their powerfully felt emotional allegiances. To let this matter pass without comment—even in the case of Jorge Mas Canosa, who managed to arouse powerful feelings in the Cuban-American community that this book only vaguely mentions—is to leave (if I can put it in a Cuban way) the beans out of the rice. And what is one to make of a book on this subject that cites not a single source in Spanish?! Por favor!¶ I regret that so many people get caught up in their case studies that they cannot step back and see how their work relates to a greater whole. Perhaps that is inherent in the American social sciences, which divide and subdivide matters, leaving the Big Picture to tomorrow. Haney and Vanderbush have done a workmanlike job, but this reviewer is left with the sense that if they had taken a broader perspective they could have lifted their study to a higher level.

#### The Affirmative is a prior question, don’t strictly evaluate body counts- instead your ballot should be a moral stand against policies that ignore human suffering for the “greater good”

Addis 2003 (Adeno Addis is William Ray Forrester Professor of Public and Constitutional Law at Tulane University Law School. “Economic Sanctions and The problem of evil”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 25.3 (2003) 573-623)

Other critics may concede that more often than not such measures would lead to the desired behavior modification, but at a cost that is often unacceptably high. Economic sanctions deprive citizens of the target state many of the basic necessities of life, leading to massive disruption and even destruction of life. The often high cost in life, liberty, and property that economic sanctions exact on innocent citizens and sectors of the target state are, to these critics, simply unacceptable even if at the end there was to be a change in the action and behavior of the regime of the target state. The moral and material costs that sanctions entail are, to these critics, simply too high to bear. Actually, there are two versions of the moral argument. The weak version is utilitarian in nature. It claims that often the cost in innocent human life and infrastructural damage is far greater than the benefit that is gained by imposing these sanctions. [13](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html#FOOT13) The strong version of the moral argument is Kantian in its outlook. It objects to economic sanctions on the ground that often, if not always, sanctions target innocent civilians for suffering as a means to achieving a foreign policy objective, contrary to Kant's categorical imperative that we treat "humanity, whether in [our] person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end." [14](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html#FOOT14) The argument here is that it is morally [End Page 576] unacceptable to impose suffering on innocent sectors of the target state, as economic sanctions do, for an objective that does not involve the prevention of the deaths of other innocent persons. [15](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html#FOOT15)

## \*\*\*Embargo Bad\*\*\*

### 2AC: Not Effective

#### Embargo not effective now- Cuba uses trade and tourism from other nations to absorb the economic impact of sanctions

[Mitchell Bustillo](http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/author/mitchell-bustillo/) [will be attending Columbia University in the fall where he will be majoring in Engineering with a minor in Economics on a Pre-Law track. He is a first-generation Cuban-American, a Hispanic Heritage Foundation Gold Medallion Winner, and a former United States Senate Page, appointed by Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison. He one day hopes to return to the Hill]¶ Time to Strengthen the Cuban Embargo¶ May 9, 2013¶ <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/05/09/time-to-strengthen-the-cuban-embargo/>

No doubt, it has been a fruitless 50 years since the embargo was enacted. Little has changed as far as democracy and human rights are concerned. To maintain control, Cuba has “managed to offset much of the effects over the years in large part because the Soviets subsidized the island for three decades, because the regime welcomed Canadian, Mexican and European capital after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and because Venezuela is its new patron,” [according to Llosa](http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2492). However, Venezuela is now undergoing a political transition of its own with the recent death of Hugo Chávez, its president for the past 14 years, and the controversial election of Nicolás Maduro.

### Not Effective- Unilateral

#### The embargo isn’t effective now- it’s a US unilateral action

Daniel Hanson, Dayne Batten & Harrison Ealey [Daniel Hanson is an economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute.  Dayne Batten is affiliated with the University of North Carolina Department of Public Policy.  Harrison Ealey is a financial analyst]¶ It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba¶ 1/16/2013 ¶ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>

At present, the U.S. is largely alone in restricting access to Cuba. The embargo has long been a point of friction between the United States and allies in Europe, South America, and Canada. Every year since 1992, the U.S. has been publically condemned in the United Nations for maintaining counterproductive and worn out trade and migration restrictions against Cuba despite the fact that nearly all 5,911 U.S. companies nationalized during the Castro takeover have dropped their claims. Moreover, since Europeans, Japanese, and Canadians can travel and conduct business in Cuba unimpeded, the sanctions are rather toothless. The State Department has argued that the cost of conducting business in Cuba is only negligibly higher because of the embargo. For American multinational corporations wishing to undertake commerce in Cuba, foreign branches find it easy to conduct exchanges.

### Not Effective- Unpredictable

#### US can’t effectively leverage the embargo now

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

5. It doesn't work. Of course, if the embargo were the last outpost of Cold War politics and it produced results, that might be an argument for continuing it. But scholars and analysts of [economic sanctions have repeatedly questioned the efficacy of economic statecraft](http://www.danieldrezner.com/archives/002832.html) against rogue states unless and until there's been regime change. And that's because, as one scholar put it, "interfering with the market (whether using sanctions, aid, or other government policies) has real economic costs, and [we rarely know enough about how the target economy works](http://blog.psaonline.org/2006/05/18/sad-cuban-engagement-for-a-sanctions-opponent/) or how to manipulate the political incentives of the target government to achieve our goals."

### Counterproductive

#### The status quo is unsustainable- rally citizens against the US

LARRY BIRNS [COHA-Council of Hemispheric Affairs- DIRECTOR]AND FREDERICK B. MILLS[COHA SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW ]¶ [Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now](http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)¶ –JANUARY 30, 2013¶ <http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/>

This essay argues that the embargo against Cuba is blatantly counterproductive, immoral, and anachronistic. If the initial purpose of this measure was to punish Havana for expropriating U.S. property and to bring about fundamental political and economic reforms, Washington has had more than 50 years to see that the status quo is flawed. Over the years, invasion, embargo, and covert psychological operations against Cuba have only served to reinforce a ‘circle the wagons’ mentality in Havana. The island also has been subject to a relentless barrage of propaganda and terrorist assaults organized by militant anti-Castro zealots to advance their cause. These attacks include the 1997 bombing of three hotels in Havana which resulted in the death of Italian tourist Fabio Di Celmo, and the deadly 1976 downing of a Cuban civilian jet. Rather than succumbing to pressure, all of these incidents have given the majority of Cuban nationals good reason to raise defensive barricades in the face of repeated threats to the survival of their homeland.

## \*\*\*Credibility Adv\*\*\*

### Now is Key Time

#### Now is the key time to build credibility in Cuba

SAUL LANDAU and NELSON P. VALDES¶ [Saul Landau, Professor Emeritus, California State University, Pomona,Nelson P. Valdes is Professor Emeritus, University of New Mexico]¶ JANUARY 29, 2013¶ A Boon for Cuban-American Entrepreneurs¶ The Economics of the Cuban Embargo¶ <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/01/29/the-economics-of-the-cuban-embargo/>

The time has come and almost gone for Washington to repair its broken relations with Cuba. For 53 years the White House has maintained a punishing embargo on trade with Cuba. Its proponents, with the goal of removing Cuba’s revolutionary government, still plead: “give it time.”¶ In 2001 President George W. Bush allowed for an exception permitting US companies to sell agricultural products to Cuba for immediate payment, although imports from Cuba remained off limits. Other economic sectors received no benefits.

### Removing Sanctions Key

#### Sanctions prove lack of cooperation and recognition of Cuba’s reforms and peace efforts – hurting US credibility in Latin America

Bogs and Thale 2012 (Clay Boggs is WOLA's Program Officer for Cuba and for Rights and Development. Geoff Thale is WOLA’s Program Director. Mr. Thale has studied Cuba issues since the mid-1990s and traveled to Cuba more than a dozen times, including organizing delegations of academics and members of Congress. 9-21-12, “US Interests Clash with Policy Toward Cuba”, http://www.wola.org/commentary/us\_interests\_clash\_with\_policy\_toward\_cuba)

On September 4, it was publicly announced that Colombia had been talking with FARC rebels in Havana, Cuba for six months (see Adam Isacson’s commentary [here](http://www.wola.org/commentary/hope_for_peace_in_colombia_reasons_for_optimism_awareness_of_obstacles)). These dialogues led to a framework for more formal talks. The United States has spent billions of dollars aiding Colombia, but it is Norway and Cuba, not the United States, that are the international mediators. To its credit, the White House issued a statement endorsing the talks. But the lack of normal diplomatic relations with Cuba complicates the United States’ ability to play the supportive role that the process deserves. (And the fact that we keep Cuba on a list of “state sponsors of terrorism” at a time when they are mediating a peace process that could dismantle a terrorist group hurts our credibility in the hemisphere). On September 13, the U.S. Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control released a report titled Preventing a Security Crisis in the Caribbean. The report argues that increased enforcement in Mexico and Central America will likely cause trafficking routes to shift back to the Caribbean. In an addendum to the report, Senator Dianne Feinstein notes that the current de facto U.S. collaboration with Cuba, through the Coast Guard, is effective at interdicting drugs. The Senator makes a series of constructive recommendations for advancing law enforcement cooperation between the United States and Cuba. WOLA advocates such strategic cooperation with Cuba as a way to advance mutual interests and has led multiple delegations to Cuba to explore these issues (see George Withers’ commentary [here](http://www.wola.org/commentary/building_bridges_in_unlikely_places_us_cuban_cooperation_on_security_issues)). Without exaggerating the benefits of drug interdiction operations per se, the minimal cooperation permitted by current U.S. policy is a textbook example of how short-sighted domestic politics undercut pragmatic partnership.

#### NO support from other nations for keeping the embargo- squo destroys credibility

LARRY BIRNS [COHA-Council of Hemispheric Affairs- DIRECTOR]AND FREDERICK B. MILLS[COHA SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW ]¶ [Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now](http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)¶ –JANUARY 30, 2013¶ <http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/>

In addition to being counter-productive and immoral, U.S. policy towards Havana is also anachronistic. During the excesses of the cold war, the U.S. sought to use harsh and unforgiving measures to isolate Cuba from its neighbors in order to limit the influence of the Cuban revolution on a variety of insurgencies being waged in the region. That narrative did not sufficiently recognize the homegrown causes of insurgency in the hemisphere. Some argue that it inadvertently drove Cuba further into the Soviet camp. Ironically, at the present juncture of world history, the embargo is in some ways isolating the U.S. rather than Cuba. Washington is often viewed as implementing a regional policy that is defenseless and without a compass. At the last Summit of the Americas in Cartagena in April 2012, member states, with the exception of Washington, made it clear that they unanimously want Cuba to participate in the next plenary meeting or the gathering will be shut down. There are new regional organizations, such as the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), that now include Cuba and exclude the U.S. Not even America’s closest allies support the embargo. Instead, over the years, leaders in NATO and the OECD member nations have visited Cuba and, in some cases, allocated lines of credit to the regime. So it was no surprise that in November of 2012, the United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly (188 – 3), for the 21st year in a row, against the US embargo. Finally, while a slim majority of Cuban Americans still favor the measure, changing demographics are eroding and outdating this support. As famed Cuban Researcher, Wayne Smith, the director of the Latin America Rights & Security: Cuba Project, at the Center for International Policy, points out, “There are now many more new young Cuban Americans who support a more sensible approach to Cuba” (Washington Post, Nov. 9, 2012).

### Link Exts – Economic Engagement Key

#### Cuban embargo prevents effective US-Latin American relations

Shifter 12 (Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>)

Another chronic irritant is US drug policy, which most Latin Americans now believe makes their drug and crime problems worse . Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, while visiting Mexico, acknowledged that US anti-drug programs have not worked . Yet, despite growing calls and pressure from the region, the United States has shown little interest in exploring alternative approaches . Similarly, Washington’s more than half-century embargo on Cuba, as well as other elements of United States’ Cuba policy, is strongly opposed by all other countries in the hemisphere . Indeed, the US position on these troublesome issues—immigration, drug policy, and Cuba—has set Washington against the consensus view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments . These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas . The United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships.

#### US-Latin American relations solve a laundry list of existential scenarios

Shifter 12 (Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf>)  
  
There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties . Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources . Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance . For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future . The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights . With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership.

#### US-Cuban economic engagement is hampered by the embargo, undermining freedom and relations

NY Times 12 (Damien Cave, November 19th, 2012, Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>)  
  
HAVANA — “If I could just get a lift,” said Francisco López, imagining the addition of a hydraulic elevator as he stood by a rusted Russian sedan in his mechanic’s workshop here. All he needed was an investment from his brother in Miami or from a Cuban friend there who already sneaks in brake pads and other parts for him. The problem: Washington’s 50-year-old trade embargo, which prohibits even the most basic business dealings across the 90 miles separating Cuba from the United States. Indeed, every time Mr. López’s friend in Florida accepts payment for a car part destined for Cuba, he puts himself at risk of a fine of up to $65,000. With Cuba cautiously introducing free-market changes that have legalized hundreds of thousands of small private businesses over the past two years, new economic bonds between Cuba and the United States have formed, creating new challenges, new possibilities — and a more complicated debate over the embargo. The longstanding logic has been that broad sanctions are necessary to suffocate the totalitarian government of Fidel and Raúl Castro. Now, especially for many Cubans who had previously stayed on the sidelines in the battle over Cuba policy, a new argument against the embargo is gaining currency — that the tentative move toward capitalism by the Cuban government could be sped up with more assistance from Americans. Even as defenders of the embargo warn against providing the Cuban government with “economic lifelines,” some Cubans and exiles are advocating a fresh approach. The Obama administration already showed an openness to engagement with Cuba in 2009 by removing restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban Americans. But with Fidel Castro, 86, retired and President Raúl Castro, 81, leading a bureaucracy that is divided on the pace and scope of change, many have begun urging President Obama to go further and update American policy by putting a priority on assistance for Cubans seeking more economic independence from the government. “Maintaining this embargo, maintaining this hostility, all it does is strengthen and embolden the hard-liners,” said Carlos Saladrigas, a Cuban exile and co-chairman of the Cuba Study Group in Washington, which advocates engagement with Cuba. “What we should be doing is helping the reformers.” Any easing would be a gamble. Free enterprise may not necessarily lead to the embargo’s goal of free elections, especially because Cuba has said it wants to replicate the paths of Vietnam and China, where the loosening of economic restrictions has not led to political change. Indeed, Cuban officials have become adept at using previous American efforts to soften the embargo to their advantage, taking a cut of dollars converted into pesos and marking up the prices at state-owned stores. And Cuba has a long history of tossing ice on warming relations. The latest example is the jailing of Alan Gross, a State Department contractor who has spent nearly three years behind bars for distributing satellite telephone equipment to Jewish groups in Havana. In Washington, Mr. Gross is seen as the main impediment to an easing of the embargo, but there are also limits to what the president could do without Congressional action. The 1992 Cuban Democracy Act conditioned the waiving of sanctions on the introduction of democratic changes inside Cuba. The 1996 Helms-Burton Act also requires that the embargo remain until Cuba has a transitional or democratically elected government. Obama administration officials say they have not given up, and could move if the president decides to act on his own. Officials say that under the Treasury Department’s licensing and regulation-writing authority, there is room for significant modification. Following the legal logic of Mr. Obama’s changes in 2009, further expansions in travel are possible along with new allowances for investment or imports and exports, especially if narrowly applied to Cuban businesses. Even these adjustments — which could also include travel for all Americans and looser rules for ships engaged in trade with Cuba, according to a legal analysis commissioned by the Cuba Study Group — would probably mean a fierce political fight. The handful of Cuban-Americans in Congress for whom the embargo is sacred oppose looser rules. When asked about Cuban entrepreneurs who are seeking more American support, Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the Florida Republican who is chairwoman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, proposed an even tighter embargo. “The sanctions on the regime must remain in place and, in fact, should be strengthened, and not be altered,” she wrote in an e-mail. “Responsible nations must not buy into the facade the dictatorship is trying to create by announcing ‘reforms’ while, in reality, it’s tightening its grip on its people.” Many Cubans agree that their government cares more about control than economic growth. Business owners complain that inspectors pounce when they see signs of success and demand receipts to prove that supplies were not stolen from the government, a common practice here. One restaurant owner in Havana said he received a large fine for failing to produce a receipt for plastic wrap. Cuban officials say the shortages fueling the black market are caused by the embargo. But mostly they prefer to discuss the policy in familiar terms. They take reporter after reporter to hospitals of frail infants, where American medical exports are allowed under a humanitarian exception. Few companies bother, however, largely because of a rule, unique to Cuba, requiring that the American companies do on-site monitoring to make sure products are not used for weapons. “The Treasury Department is asking me, in a children’s hospital, if I use, for example, catheters for military uses — chemical, nuclear or biological,” said Dr. Eugenio Selman, director of the William Soler Pediatric Cardiology Center. As for the embargo’s restriction on investment, Cuban officials have expressed feelings that are more mixed. At a meeting in New York in September with a group called Cuban Americans for Engagement, Cuba’s foreign minister, Bruno Rodríguez Parrilla, said business investment was not a priority. “Today the economic development of Cuba does not demand investments of $100,000, $200,000, $300,000,” he said, according to the group’s account of the meeting. Rather, he called for hundreds of millions of dollars to expand a local port. Owners of Cuba’s small businesses, mostly one-person operations at this point, say they know that the government would most likely find ways to profit from wider economic relations with the United States. The response to the informal imports that come from Miami in the suitcases of relatives, for instance, has been higher customs duties. Still, in a country where Cubans “resolve” their way around government restrictions every day (private deals with customs agents are common), many Cubans anticipate real benefits should the United States change course. Mr. López, a meticulous mechanic who wears plastic gloves to avoid dirtying his fingers, said legalizing imports and investment would create a flood of the supplies that businesses needed, overwhelming the government’s controls while lowering prices and creating more work apart from the state. Other Cubans, including political dissidents, say softening the embargo would increase the pressure for more rapid change by undermining one of the government’s main excuses for failing to provide freedom, economic opportunity or just basic supplies. “Last month, someone asked me to redo their kitchen, but I told them I couldn’t do it because I didn’t have the materials,” said Pedro José, 49, a licensed carpenter in Havana who did not want his last name published to avoid government pressure. “Look around — Cuba is destroyed,” he added, waving a hand toward a colonial building blushing with circles of faded pink paint from the 1950s. “There is a lot of work to be done.”

### A2 Relations Tanked

#### US presence inevitable – ups and downs provide possibility for reinvigorating relations

Alvarado 2013 (Liza Alvarado, Liza Torres Alvarado is a former diplomat in the Mission of Venezuela to the Organization of American States. 5-13-13, “The US Must Re-evaluate its Foreign Policy in Latin America, http://www.diplomaticourier.com/news/regions/latin-america/1457)

Although there has been a decline in U.S. influence in the region, its presence is still there. In Venezuela, for example, U.S. oil companies have seen their actions limited, yet they still operate there. The United States is Venezuela’s top commercial partner, as Venezuela supplies 12 percent of U.S. oil imports. Relations between the United States and Latin America have experienced cyclical ups and downs. Geographically, the United States and Latin America are linked and have a natural shared market, so there will always be a relationship of one sort or another. The United States will continue to seek to exert its influence over the region, whether through future plans for the placement of military bases or the promotion of bilateral trade agreements.

### Impact Exts – Economy

#### Economic conflicts cause extinction

Daguzan 10 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, "Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings" November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threatenthe well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France.¶ ¶ He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings.¶ ¶ Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed.¶ ¶ He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges.¶ ¶ He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

### Impact Exts – Climate Change

#### Warming makes sustaining biodiversity impossible – the impact is extinction

Potsdam Institute, 2012 (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics, “Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided”, A report for the World Bank, November, http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn\_Down\_the\_heat\_Why\_a\_4\_degree\_centrigrade\_warmer\_world\_must\_be\_avoided.pdf)

Ecosystems and their species provide a range of important goods and services for human society. These include water, food, cultural and other values. In the AR4 an assessment of climate change effects on ecosystems and their services found the following: • If greenhouse gas emissions and other stresses continue at or above current rates, the resilience of many ecosystems is likely to be exceeded by an unprecedented combination of change in climate, associated disturbances (for example, flooding, drought, wildfire, insects, and ocean acidification) and other stressors (global change drivers) including land use change, pollution and over-exploitation of resources. • Approximately 20 to 30 percent of plant and animal species assessed so far are likely to be at increased risk of extinction, if increases in global average temperature exceed of 2–3° above preindustrial levels. • For increases in global average temperature exceeding 2 to 3° above preindustrial levels and in concomitant atmospheric CO2 concentrations, major changes are projected in ecosystem structure and function, species’ ecological interactions and shifts in species’ geographical ranges, with predominantly negative consequences for biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services, such as water and food supply. It is known that past large-scale losses of global ecosystems and species extinctions have been associated with rapid climate change combined with other ecological stressors. Loss and/or degradation of ecosystems, and rates of extinction because of human pressures over the last century or more, which have intensified in recent decades, have contributed to a very high rate of extinction by geological standards. It is well established that loss or degradation of ecosystem services occurs as a consequence of species extinctions, declining species abundance, or widespread shifts in species and biome distributions (Leadley et al. 2010). Climate change is projected to exacerbate the situation. This section outlines the likely consequences for some key ecosystems and for biodiversity. The literature tends to confirm the conclusions from the AR4 outlined above. Despite the existence of detailed and highly informative case studies, upon which this section will draw, it is also important to recall that there remain many uncertainties (Bellard, Bertelsmeier, Leadley, Thuiller, and Courchamp, 2012). However, threshold behavior is known to occur in biological systems (Barnosky et al. 2012) and most model projections agree on major adverse consequences for biodiversity in a 4°C world (Bellard et al., 2012). With high levels of warming, coalescing human induced stresses on ecosystems have the potential to trigger large-scale ecosystem collapse (Barnosky et al. 2012). Furthermore, while uncertainty remains in the projections, there is a risk not only of major loss of valuable ecosystem services, particularly to the poor and the most vulnerable who depend on them, but also of feedbacks being initiated that would result in ever higher CO2 emissions and thus rates of global warming. Significant effects of climate change are already expected for warming well below 4°C. In a scenario of 2.5°C warming, severe ecosystem change, based on absolute and relative changes in carbon and water fluxes and stores, cannot be ruled out on any continent (Heyder, Schaphoff, Gerten, & Lucht, 2011). If warming is limited to less than 2°C, with constant or slightly declining precipitation, small biome shifts are projected, and then only in temperate and tropical regions. Considerable change is projected for cold and tropical climates already at 3°C of warming. At greater than 4°C of warming, biomes in temperate zones will also be substantially affected. These changes would impact not only the human and animal communities that directly rely on the ecosystems, but would also exact a cost (economic and otherwise) on society as a whole, ranging from extensive loss of biodiversity and diminished land cover, through to loss of ecosystems services such as fisheries and forestry (de Groot et al., 2012; Farley et al., 2012). Ecosystems have been found to be particularly sensitive to geographical patterns of climate change (Gonzalez, Neilson, Lenihan, and Drapek, 2010). Moreover, ecosystems are affected not only by local changes in the mean temperature and precipitation, along with changes in the variability of these quantities and changes by the occurrence of extreme events. These climatic variables are thus decisive factors in determining plant structure and ecosystem composition (Reu et al., 2011). Increasing vulnerability to heat and drought stress will likely lead to increased mortality and species extinction. For example, temperature extremes have already been held responsible for mortality in Australian flying-fox species (Welbergen, Klose, Markus, and Eby 2008), and interactions between phenological changes driven by gradual climate changes and extreme events can lead to reduced fecundity (Campbell et al. 2009; Inouye, 2008). Climate change also has the potential to facilitate the spread and establishment of invasive species (pests and weeds) (Hellmann, Byers, Bierwagen, & Dukes, 2008; Rahel & Olden, 2008) with often detrimental implications for ecosystem services and biodiversity. Human land-use changes are expected to further exacerbate climate change driven ecosystem changes, particularly in the tropics, where rising temperatures and reduced precipitation are expected to have major impacts (Campbell et al., 2009; Lee & Jetz, 2008). Ecosystems will be affected by the increased occurrence of extremes such as forest loss resulting from droughts and wildfire exacerbated by land use and agricultural expansion (Fischlin et al., 2007). Climate change also has the potential to catalyze rapid shifts in ecosystems such as sudden forest loss or regional loss of agricultural productivity resulting from desertification (Barnosky et al., 2012). The predicted increase in extreme climate events would also drive dramatic ecosystem changes (Thibault and Brown 2008; Wernberg, Smale, and Thomsen 2012). One such extreme event that is expected to have immediate impacts on ecosystems is the increased rate of wildfire occurrence. Climate change induced shifts in the fire regime are therefore in turn powerful drivers of biome shifts, potentially resulting in considerable changes in carbon fluxes over large areas (Heyder et al., 2011; Lavorel et al., 2006) It is anticipated that global warming will lead to global biome shifts (Barnosky et al. 2012). Based on 20th century observations and 21st century projections, poleward latitudinal biome shifts of up to 400 km are possible in a 4° C world (Gonzalez et al., 2010). In the case of mountaintop ecosystems, for example, such a shift is not necessarily possible, putting them at particular risk of extinction (La Sorte and Jetz, 2010). Species that dwell at the upper edge of continents or on islands would face a similar impediment to adaptation, since migration into adjacent ecosystems is not possible (Campbell, et al. 2009; Hof, Levinsky, Araújo, and Rahbek 2011). The consequences of such geographical shifts, driven by climatic changes as well as rising CO2 concentrations, would be found in both reduced species richness and species turnover (for example, Phillips et al., 2008; White and Beissinger 2008). A study by (Midgley and Thuiller, 2011) found that, of 5,197 African plant species studied, 25–42 percent could lose all suitable range by 2085. It should be emphasized that competition for space with human agriculture over the coming century is likely to prevent vegetation expansion in most cases (Zelazowski et al., 2011) Species composition changes can lead to structural changes of the entire ecosystem, such as the increase in lianas in tropical and temperate forests (Phillips et al., 2008), and the encroachment of woody plants in temperate grasslands (Bloor et al., 2008, Ratajczak et al., 2012), putting grass-eating herbivores at risk of extinction because of a lack of food available—this is just one example of the sensitive intricacies of ecosystem responses to external perturbations. There is also an increased risk of extinction for herbivores in regions of drought-induced tree dieback, owing to their inability to digest the newly resident C4 grasses (Morgan et al., 2008). The following provides some examples of ecosystems that have been identified as particularly vulnerable to climate change. The discussion is restricted to ecosystems themselves, rather than the important and often extensive impacts on ecosystems services. Boreal-temperate ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change, although there are large differences in projections, depending on the future climate model and emission pathway studied. Nevertheless there is a clear risk of large-scale forest dieback in the boreal-temperate system because of heat and drought (Heyder et al., 2011). Heat and drought related die-back has already been observed in substantial areas of North American boreal forests (Allen et al., 2010), characteristic of vulnerability to heat and drought stress leading to increased mortality at the trailing edge of boreal forests. The vulnerability of transition zones between boreal and temperate forests, as well as between boreal forests and polar/tundra biomes, is corroborated by studies of changes in plant functional richness with climate change (Reu et al., 2011), as well as analyses using multiple dynamic global vegetation models (Gonzalez et al., 2010). Subtle changes within forest types also pose a great risk to biodiversity as different plant types gain dominance (Scholze et al., 2006). Humid tropical forests also show increasing risk of major climate induced losses. At 4°C warming above pre-industrial levels, the land extent of humid tropical forest, characterized by tree species diversity and biomass density, is expected to contract to approximately 25 percent of its original size [see Figure 3 in (Zelazowski et al., 2011)], while at 2°C warming, more than 75 percent of the original land can likely be preserved. For these ecosystems, water availability is the dominant determinant of climate suitability (Zelazowski et al., 2011). In general, Asia is substantially less at risk of forest loss than the tropical Americas. However, even at 2°C, the forest in the Indochina peninsula will be at risk of die-back. At 4°C, the area of concern grows to include central Sumatra, Sulawesi, India and the Philippines, where up to 30 percent of the total humid tropical forest niche could be threatened by forest retreat (Zelazowski et al., 2011). There has been substantial scientific debate over the risk of a rapid and abrupt change to a much drier savanna or grassland ecosystem under global warming. This risk has been identified as a possible planetary tipping point at around a warming of 3.5–4.5°C, which, if crossed, would result in a major loss of biodiversity, ecosystem services and the loss of a major terrestrial carbon sink, increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations (Lenton et al., 2008)(Cox, et al., 2004) (Kriegler, Hall, Held, Dawson, and Schellnhuber, 2009). Substantial uncertainty remains around the likelihood, timing and onset of such risk due to a range of factors including uncertainty in precipitation changes, effects of CO2 concentration increase on water use efficiency and the CO2 fertilization effect, land-use feedbacks and interactions with fire frequency and intensity, and effects of higher temperature on tropical tree species and on important ecosystem services such as pollinators. While climate model projections for the Amazon, and in particular precipitation, remain quite uncertain recent analyses using IPCC AR4 generation climate indicates a reduced risk of a major basin wide loss of precipitation compared to some earlier work. If drying occurs then the likelihood of an abrupt shift to a drier, less biodiverse ecosystem would increase. Current projections indicate that fire occurrence in the Amazon could double by 2050, based on the A2 SRES scenario that involves warming of approximately 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels (Silvestrini et al., 2011), and can therefore be expected to be even higher in a 4°C world. Interactions of climate change, land use and agricultural expansion increase the incidence of fire (Aragão et al., 2008), which plays a major role in the (re)structuring of vegetation (Gonzalez et al., 2010; Scholze et al., 2006). A decrease in precipitation over the Amazon forests may therefore result in forest retreat or transition into a low biomass forest (Malhi et al., 2009). Moderating this risk is a possible increase in ecosystem water use efficiency with increasing CO2 concentrations is accounted for, more than 90 percent of the original humid tropical forest niche in Amazonia is likely to be preserved in the 2°C case, compared to just under half in the 4°C warming case (see Figure 5 in Zelazowski et al., 2011) (Cook, Zeng, and Yoon, 2012; Salazar & Nobre, 2010). Recent work has analyzed a number of these factors and their uncertainties and finds that the risk of major loss of forest due to climate is more likely to be regional than Amazon basin-wide, with the eastern and southeastern Amazon being most at risk (Zelazowski et al., 2011). Salazar and Nobre (2010) estimates a transition from tropical forests to seasonal forest or savanna in the eastern Amazon could occur at warming at warming of 2.5–3.5°C when CO2 fertilization is not considered and 4.5–5.5°C when it is considered. It is important to note, as Salazar and Nobre (2010) point out, that the effects of deforestation and increased fire risk interact with the climate change and are likely to accelerate a transition from tropical forests to drier ecosystems. Increased CO2 concentration may also lead to increased plant water efficiency (Ainsworth and Long, 2005), lowering the risk of plant die-back, and resulting in vegetation expansion in many regions, such as the Congo basin, West Africa and Madagascar (Zelazowski et al., 2011), in addition to some dry-land ecosystems (Heyder et al., 2011). The impact of CO2 induced ‘greening’ would, however, negatively affect biodiversity in many ecosystems. In particular encroachment of woody plants into grasslands and savannahs in North American grassland and savanna communities could lead to a decline of up to 45 percent in species richness ((Ratajczak and Nippert, 2012) and loss of specialist savanna plant species in southern Africa (Parr, Gray, and Bond, 2012). Mangroves are an important ecosystem and are particularly vulnerable to the multiple impacts of climate change, such as: rise in sea levels, increases in atmospheric CO2 concentration, air and water temperature, and changes in precipitation patterns. Sea-level rise can cause a loss of mangroves by cutting off the flow of fresh water and nutrients and drowning the roots (Dasgupta, Laplante et al. 2010). By the end of the 21st century, global mangrove cover is projected to experience a significant decline because of heat stress and sea-level rise (Alongi, 2008; Beaumont et al., 2011). In fact, it has been estimated that under the A1B emissions scenario (3.5°C relative to pre-industrial levels) mangroves would need to geographically move on average about 1 km/year to remain in suitable climate zones (Loarie et al., 2009). The most vulnerable mangrove forests are those occupying low-relief islands such as small islands in the Pacific where sea-level rise is a dominant factor. Where rivers are lacking and/ or land is subsiding, vulnerability is also high. With mangrove losses resulting from deforestation presently at 1 to 2 percent per annum (Beaumont et al., 2011), climate change may not be the biggest immediate threat to the future of mangroves. However if conservation efforts are successful in the longer term climate change may become a determining issue (Beaumont et al., 2011). Coral reefs are acutely sensitive to changes in water temperatures, ocean pH and intensity and frequency of tropical cyclones. Mass coral bleaching is caused by ocean warming and ocean acidification, which results from absorption of CO2 (for example, Frieler et al., 2012a). Increased sea-surface temperatures and a reduction of available carbonates are also understood to be driving causes of decreased rates of calcification, a critical reef-building process (De’ath, Lough, and Fabricius, 2009). The effects of climate change on coral reefs are already apparent. The Great Barrier Reef, for example, has been estimated to have lost 50 percent of live coral cover since 1985, which is attributed in part to coral bleaching because of increasing water temperatures (De’ath et al., 2012). Under atmospheric CO2 concentrations that correspond to a warming of 4°C by 2100, reef erosion will likely exceed rates of calcification, leaving coral reefs as “crumbling frameworks with few calcareous corals” (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2007). In fact, frequency of bleaching events under global warming in even a 2°C world has been projected to exceed the ability of coral reefs to recover. The extinction of coral reefs would be catastrophic for entire coral reef ecosystems and the people who depend on them for food, income and shoreline. Reefs provide coastal protection against coastal floods and rising sea levels, nursery grounds and habitat for a variety of currently fished species, as well as an invaluable tourism asset. These valuable services to often subsistence-dependent coastal and island societies will most likely be lost well before a 4°C world is reached. The preceding discussion reviewed the implications of a 4°C world for just a few examples of important ecosystems. The section below examines the effects of climate on biological diversity Ecosystems are composed ultimately of the species and interactions between them and their physical environment. Biologically rich ecosystems are usually diverse and it is broadly agreed that there exists a strong link between this biological diversity and ecosystem productivity, stability and functioning (McGrady-Steed, Harris, and Morin, 1997; David Tilman, Wedin, and Knops, 1996)(Hector, 1999; D Tilman et al., 2001). Loss of species within ecosystems will hence have profound negative effects on the functioning and stability of ecosystems and on the ability of ecosystems to provide goods and services to human societies. It is the overall diversity of species that ultimately characterizes the biodiversity and evolutionary legacy of life on Earth. As was noted at the outset of this discussion, species extinction rates are now at very high levels compared to the geological record. Loss of those species presently classified as ‘critically endangered’ would lead to mass extinction on a scale that has happened only five times before in the last 540 million years. The loss of those species classified as ‘endangered’ and ‘vulnerable’ would confirm this loss as the sixth mass extinction episode (Barnosky 2011). Loss of biodiversity will challenge those reliant on ecosystems services. Fisheries (Dale, Tharp, Lannom, and Hodges, 2010), and agronomy (Howden et al., 2007) and forestry industries (Stram & Evans, 2009), among others, will need to match species choices to the changing climate conditions, while devising new strategies to tackle invasive pests (Bellard, Bertelsmeier, Leadley, Thuiller, and Courchamp, 2012). These challenges would have to be met in the face of increasing competition between natural and agricultural ecosystems over water resources. Over the 21st-century climate change is likely to result in some bio-climates disappearing, notably in the mountainous tropics and in the poleward regions of continents, with new, or novel, climates developing in the tropics and subtropics (Williams, Jackson, and Kutzbach, 2007). In this study novel climates are those where 21st century projected climates do not overlap with their 20th century analogues, and disappearing climates are those 20th century climates that do not overlap with 21st century projected climates. The projections of Williams et al (2007) indicate that in a 4°C world (SRES A2), 12–39 percent of the Earth’s land surface may experience a novel climate compared to 20th century analogues. Predictions of species response to novel climates are difficult because researchers have no current analogue to rely upon. However, at least such climates would give rise to disruptions, with many current species associations being broken up or disappearing entirely. Under the same scenario an estimated 10–48 percent of the Earth’s surface including highly biodiverse regions such as the Himalayas, Mesoamerica, eastern and southern Africa, the Philippines and the region around Indonesia known as Wallacaea would lose their climate space. With limitations on how fast species can disperse, or move, this indicates that many species may find themselves without a suitable climate space and thus face a high risk of extinction. Globally, as in other studies, there is a strong association apparent in these projections between regions where the climate disappears and biodiversity hotspots. Limiting warming to lower levels in this study showed substantially reduced effects, with the magnitude of novel and disappearing climates scaling linearly with global mean warming. More recent work by Beaumont and colleagues using a different approach confirms the scale of this risk (Beaumont et al., 2011, Figure 36). Analysis of the exposure of 185 eco-regions of exceptional biodiversity (a subset of the so-called Global 200) to extreme monthly temperature and precipitation conditions in the 21st century compared to 1961–1990 conditions shows that within 60 years almost all of the regions that are already exposed to substantial environmental and social pressure, will experience extreme temperature conditions based on the A2 emission scenario (4.1°C global mean temperature rise by 2100) (Beaumont et al., 2011). Tropical and sub-tropical eco-regions in Africa and South America are particularly vulnerable. Vulnerability to such extremes is particularly acute for high latitude and small island biota, which are very limited in their ability to respond to range shifts, and to those biota, such as flooded grassland, mangroves and desert biomes, that would require large geographical displacements to find comparable climates in a warmer world. The overall sense of recent literature confirms the findings of the AR4 summarized at the beginning of the section, with a number of risks such as those to coral reefs occurring at significantly lower temperatures than estimated in that report. Although non-climate related human pressures are likely to remain a major and defining driver of loss of ecosystems and biodiversity in the coming decades, it is also clear that as warming rises so will the predominance of climate change as a determinant of ecosystem and biodiversity survival. While the factors of human stresses on ecosystems are manifold, in a 4°C world, climate change is likely to become a determining driver of ecosystem shifts and large-scale biodiversity loss (Bellard et al., 2012; New et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that large-scale loss of biodiversity is likely to occur in a 4°C world, with climate change and high CO2 concentration driving a transition of the Earth´s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience. Such damages to ecosystems would be expected to dramatically reduce the provision of ecosystem services on which society depends (e.g., hydrology—quantity flow rates, quality; fisheries (corals), protection of coastline (loss of mangroves). Barnosky has described the present situation facing the biodiversity of the planet as “the perfect storm” with multiple high intensity ecological stresses because of habitat modification and degradation, pollution and other factors, unusually rapid climate change and unusually high and elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations. In the past, as noted above, this combination of circumstances has led to major, mass extinctions with planetary consequences. Thus, there is a growing risk that climate change, combined with other human activities, will cause the irreversible transition of the Earth´s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience (Barnosky et al., 2012).

### Solvency- Sends Signal

#### The plan sends a strong signal to the region improving relations and boosting our influence

Kathy Castor [U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times]special to the Times¶ May 18, 2013¶ What I learned in Cuba¶ <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>

Reforming Cuba policy will improve our diplomatic standing in the region and, at a critical moment, strengthen the credibility of our policy against terrorism. The Summit of the Americas concluded in 2012 with a warning from our allies that if Cuba is not allowed to attend the 2015 Summit of the Americas in Panama, they will boycott this important regional conference. The Obama administration should use the next two years to put U.S.-Cuban relations on a constructive path.¶ In this context, America could send a powerful signal to our allies in the region by responding creatively and appropriately to the peace negotiations taking place in Cuba between the government of Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC. These peace talks may result in an end to five decades of violence and provide the United States with an important foreign policy victory. The United States has devoted years of leadership and millions of dollars of investment for peace in Colombia. All Western Hemisphere nations, including Cuba, should continue to work together to end the violence.¶ The Obama administration and Cuban government recently proved that direct dialogue can produce positive results. Right on the heels of my return to Tampa, Cuban officials expeditiously returned Cole and Chase Hakken, ages 4 and 2, who had been kidnapped by their parents in Tampa and taken by boat to Cuba. I was able to speak directly to U.S. and Cuban officials to ensure that the boys were safe and urge their speedy return. Through the contacts I had made days earlier, I was able to connect the U.S. consul with the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Department and the boys' grandparents. The ability to communicate with these officials I had just met in Cuba is a simple example of the value of engagement and why it should become a principal feature of a new, reformed policy.

### Solvency- Environment

#### The plan boosts US influence with Cuba- persuades them to be environmental with development

Kathy Castor [U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times]special to the Times¶ May 18, 2013¶ What I learned in Cuba¶ <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>

During my visit, Cuban officials made it clear to me they would like the embargo lifted and that they seek an improved relationship. America's allies in the Western Hemisphere have encouraged the United States to do so. Cuba and its citizens are more than a decade behind with respect to the Internet and broadband. Expansion of this advanced technology will be slow, but the improvement to human rights and efficiencies to Cuban society could be enormous.¶ Cuba and other foreign interests continue to prospect for oil in its territorial waters (so close to sensitive environmental resources in the Florida Straits). Despite multilateral discussions among the United States and Caribbean nations, the United States should have a more direct relationship. Cuba and Brazil are making a large investment in the modernization of Cuba's Port of Mariel in advance of the widening of the Panama Canal. U.S. ports, businesses and environmental concerns would benefit, or at least gain greater influence and understanding, with more direct engagement.

### Solvency- With Cuba

#### The US embargo allows Cuba to demonize the US stunting democratic efforts

[Ted Piccone](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/picconet) [Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy)]¶ MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT | January 17, 2013 ¶ Opening to Havana¶ <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/opening-to-havana>

Current U.S. policy long ago outlived its usefulness and is counterproductive to advancing the goal of helping the Cuban people. Instead it gives Cuban officials the ability to demonize the United States in the eyes of Cubans, other Latin Americans and the rest of the world, which annually condemns the embargo at the United Nations. At this rate, given hardening attitudes in the region against U.S. policy, the Cuba problem may even torpedo your next presidential Summit of the Americas in Panama in 2015. It is time for a new approach: an initiative to test the willingness of the Cuban government to engage constructively alongside an effort to empower the Cuban people.

### Solvency- Regional Influence

#### The squo locks out US influence in the region but plan reverses it- creates economic ties

[Ted Piccone](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/picconet) [Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy)]¶ MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT | January 17, 2013¶ Opening to Havana¶ <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/opening-to-havana>

Your second term presents a rare opportunity to turn the page of history from an outdated Cold War approach to Cuba to a new era of constructive engagement that will encourage a process of reform already underway on the island. Cuba is changing, slowly but surely, as it struggles to adapt its outdated economic model to the 21st century while preserving one-party rule. Reforms that empower Cuban citizens to open their own businesses, buy and sell property, hire employees, own cell phones, and travel off the island offer new opportunities for engagement.¶ Recommendation:¶ You can break free of the straitjacket of the embargo by asserting your executive authority to facilitate trade, travel and communications with the Cuban people. This will help establish your legacy of rising above historical grievances, advance U.S. interests in a stable, prosperous and democratic Cuba, and pave the way for greater U.S. leadership in the region.¶ Background:¶ Early in your first term, you made an important down payment on fostering change in Cuba by expanding travel and remittances to the island. Since then, hundreds of thousands of the 1.8 million Cuban-Americans in the United States have traveled to Cuba and sent over $2 billion to relatives there, providing important fuel to the burgeoning small business sector and helping individual citizens become less dependent on the state. Your decision to liberalize travel and assistance for the Cuban diaspora proved popular in Florida and helped increase your share of the Cuban-American vote by ten points in Miami-Dade county in the 2012 election.¶ As a result of your actions and changing demographics, families are more readily reuniting across the Florida straits, opening new channels of commerce and communication that are encouraging reconciliation among Cuban-Americans and a more general reframing of how best to support the Cuban people. Cuba’s recent decision to lift exit controls for most Cubans on the island is likely to accelerate this process of reconciliation within the Cuban diaspora, thereby softening support for counterproductive tactics like the embargo. The new travel rules also require a re-think of the outdated U.S. migration policy in order to manage a potential spike in departures from the island to the United States. For example, the team handling your immigration reform bill should be charged with devising proposals to reduce the special privileges afforded Cubans who make it to U.S. soil.¶ Under Raul Castro, the Cuban government has continued to undertake a number of important reforms to modernize its economy, lessen its dependence on Hugo Chavez’s Venezuela, and allow citizens to make their own decisions about their economic futures. The process of reform, however, is gradual, highly controlled and short on yielding game-changing results that would ignite the economy. Failure to tap new offshore oil and gas fields and agricultural damage from Hurricane Sandy dealt further setbacks. Independent civil society remains confined, repressed and harassed, and strict media and internet controls severely restrict the flow of information. The Castro generation is slowly handing power over to the next generation of party and military leaders who will determine the pace and scope of the reform process.¶ These trends suggest that an inflection point is approaching and that now is the time to try a new paradigm for de-icing the frozen conflict. The embargo — the most complex and strictest embargo against any country in the world — has handcuffed the United States and has prevented it from having any positive influence on the island’s developments. It will serve American interests better to learn how to work with the emerging Cuban leaders while simultaneously ramping up direct U.S. outreach to the Cuban people.

### Solvency- International

#### The embargo destroys the US image abroad

Daniel Hanson, Dayne Batten & Harrison Ealey [Daniel Hanson is an economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute.  Dayne Batten is affiliated with the University of North Carolina Department of Public Policy.  Harrison Ealey is a financial analyst]¶ It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba¶ 1/16/2013 ¶ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>

At present, the U.S. is largely alone in restricting access to Cuba. The embargo has long been a point of friction between the United States and allies in Europe, South America, and Canada. Every year since 1992, the U.S. has been publically condemned in the United Nations for maintaining counterproductive and worn out trade and migration restrictions against Cuba despite the fact that nearly all 5,911 U.S. companies nationalized during the Castro takeover have dropped their claims.

## \*\*\*Econ Adv\*\*\*

### Econ Impact- Civilization Collapse/ Violence

#### Economic collapse destroys the foundations of society- crushes basic value to life and ensures widespread violent conflict

David A Mayer [earned his B.S. in Economics from Texas A&M University and his M.Ed. in Educational Psychology from the University of Texas at San Antonio. Mayer has had an extensive career teaching economics to high school students. Mr. Mayer serves as an AP Economics consultant for the College Board and is an AP Economics Reader and Table Leader for Educational Testing Service. He has also written several economics books and test preps]¶ ¶ February 28th, 2012¶ ¶ ¶ Society’s Five Stages of Economic Collapse¶ ¶ <http://www.shtfplan.com/emergency-preparedness/societys-five-stages-of-economic-collapse_02282012>

Society as we know it will break down and collapse in a five stage process outlined here. While it can be accelerated by certain events like war, a natural disaster, pandemic, terrorist attack, or even an impending asteroid impact, history has shown that economic collapse will essentially happen in this five stage process. To survive the collapse, it is important to read and interpret the signs and understand what assets are important to the current situation so you can be prepared for the worst thereby allowing you to survive intact and with as little damage as possible.¶ STAGE 1. The Decay Begins¶ Everything is good and the economy is thriving. A high standard of living has been achieved. This is the way things should be. Goods are cheap and readily available. Everything seems to be in abundance. Stores are filled with retail items ready to be purchased. Life in general is good. The nation’s working infrastructure is solidly intact and working well. However, the idea that everyone is entitled to have what others have earned now permeates society. Redistribution of Wealth Policies are implemented and quietly woven into the fabric of society. Unchecked and under the guise of fairness and equality, these policies slowly decrease productivity and increase dependency on government entitlement and welfare programs.¶ Primary Assets:¶ Career¶ Home Value¶ Savings¶ Investments – Stocks and bonds¶ Health Insurance¶ Lifestyle Image¶ Good Credit Rating for Debt Accumulation¶ STAGE 2. The Slippery Slope¶ The economy goes into a slow but steadily increasing decline. Unemployment is on the rise. Ever increasing numbers of people receive government assistance in one form or another. People are paid not to work. Government spending has increased dramatically. The price of gold, silver, and other precious metals rise to prices unheard of just a few years earlier. Inflation reaches the double digit levels.¶ Primary Assets:¶ Cash¶ Precious Metals, Gold and Silver coins¶ Job Stability¶ Elimination of debt¶ Health Insurance¶ Home Equity¶ Automobile with good MPG¶ Acquiring secluded land more than 40 miles from densely populated areas¶ STAGE 3. It is Going to Get Worse¶ The total collapse of the economy begins after a significant and prolonged decline. The government implements price controls. Shortages on essential goods become widespread. Foreclosed houses sit vacant and deteriorating by the tens of thousands. Middle class neighborhoods begin to look like slums. The government begins to print currency to pay its bills and support the tens of millions on public assistance. Inflation increases even more and unemployment exceeds 25%. Banks and businesses fail at ever increasing rates. Nobody seems to have any money. Many are now homeless. Labor unions instigate strikes, civil unrest, and large scale riots. Government services are interrupted and unreliable. Local and national infrastructure is in decay. Violent gangs begin to appear and assert themselves. The government begins confiscation of firearms from law abiding citizens. Violence is everywhere. Cities and urban areas become very dangerous places to live.¶ At this stage, the country seems pretty much beyond the point of no return. However, things can still be reversed even at this stage if the right person at the top really believes in the basic fundamental concepts of Freedom, Independence, Liberty, and Individual Rights and is not afraid to do what is necessary to reverse the current trend. He will be vilified and hated because of his attitude toward personal responsibility, cutting entitlements, and ending welfare programs. Of course, if the right person were in power and did what needed to be done, none of this would have happened in the first place.¶ Primary Assets:¶ Gold and Silver coins¶ Cash¶ Job¶ Automobile¶ Home¶ Short term food supplies¶ Short term fuel stores¶ Firearms and ammo¶ Plans to relocate to a secluded rural hideaway¶ Small livestock – chicken, rabbit, fish…¶ A close network of like minded people¶ Survival knowledge and skills¶ STAGE 4. The Grab for Power¶ The collapse can transition to this stage at any time after Stage 3. Most of the middle class have lost everything. What used to be well manicured middle class neighborhoods are filled with the carcasses of empty houses damaged and destroyed by vandals. The nation’s infrastructure has been seriously neglected and is in need of a major overhaul. The power grid becomes unreliable. Rolling blackouts are a daily occurrence. You can no longer buy or sell gold or own foreign currency. Inflation is out of control. Now the economy collapses. There is a rush for everything and the shelves go empty in a matter of hours. Society falls into chaos. The control of urban areas shifts when violent gangs takeover control of the streets and urban neighborhoods. The government issues restrictive measures in an attempt to control the economy. Everything is in short supply and heavily rationed. Food and gasoline is very expensive and there are very long lines to get them when they are available. Affordable quality health care is non-existent and your job is a distant memory. You will do without what you are unable to provide for yourself. You will discover what it is to live in a third world country.¶ Primary Assets:¶ Relocation to the rural hideaway¶ Firearms and ammo¶ Long term food supplies (1 year minimum)¶ Adequate fuel stores¶ Security plan to protect the group and assets¶ Trained dog for security¶ A working knowledge of survival gardening¶ Survival knowledge and skills¶ Once all of the above has come to pass, the realization of the current circumstances at this moment must be all too obvious. It is too late to prepare at this point. What you did not acquire earlier, you are not going to possess now. Anything of value necessary for your survival has already been claimed. The situation gets worse… much worse.¶ Stage 5 is next… and it is not pretty.¶ STAGE 5. Freedom, Liberty, and Independence is Lost¶ The government implements martial law. Fighting between civilians and government forces break out nationwide. Maintaining more than a 30 day supply of food is considered hoarding food and is illegal. Severe poverty and starvation become a common sight. The government offers marginally acceptable food, water and shelter in exchange for your Freedom, Liberty, and Independence. Democracy ends and a Socialist form of government takes over under the guise of fixing society’s problems with the false promise that peace and prosperity will return better than it was just a few years ago. A Totalitarian regime assumes power and the individual freedoms and liberties once enjoyed by the people are completely eliminated.¶ Primary Assets:¶ Rural Hideaway¶ Security plan to protect the group and assets¶ Living below the radar in a community of like minded people¶ Firearms and the ability to use them¶ Guard dog for security¶ Survival knowledge and skills¶ A working and producing garden capable of feeding 150% of the group¶ A stable supply of clean water¶ Vegetable seeds for long term food production and barter¶ The will to live and survive in a harsh political climate¶ As you can see, priorities change as the world changes. Your most prized assets of today – your good credit, luxury automobile, and career are no longer important after the economy collapses.

### Embargo Wasteful Spending

#### The Cuban embargo is counterproductive and wastes hundreds of millions of dollars

Daniel Hanson, Dayne Batten & Harrison Ealey [Daniel Hanson is an economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute.  Dayne Batten is affiliated with the University of North Carolina Department of Public Policy.  Harrison Ealey is a financial analyst]¶ It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba¶ 1/16/2013 ¶ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>

For the first time in more than fifty years, Cuban citizens can travel abroad without permission from their government. The move, part of a broader reform package being phased in by Raul Castro, underscores the irrationality of America’s continuation of a five-decade old embargo.¶ While the embargo has been through several legal iterations in the intervening years, the general tenor of the U.S. position toward Cuba is a hardline not-in-my-backyard approach to communism a la the[Monroe](http://www.forbes.com/places/mi/monroe/) Doctrine. The official position is outdated, hypocritical, and counterproductive.¶ The Cuban embargo was inaugurated by a Kennedy administration executive order in 1960 as a response to the confiscation of American property in Cuba under the newly installed Castro regime. The current incarnation of the embargo – codified primarily in the Helms-Burton Act – aims at producing free markets and representative democracy in Cuba through economic sanctions, travel restrictions, and international legal penalties.¶ Since Fidel Castro abdicated power to his brother Raul in 2008, the government has undertaken more than 300 economic reforms designed to encourage enterprise, and restrictions have been lifted on property use, travel, farming, municipal governance, electronics access, and more. Cuba is still a place of oppression and gross human rights abuse, but recent events would indicate the 11 million person nation is moving in the right direction.¶ Despite this progress, the U.S. spends massive amounts of money trying to keep illicit Cuban goods out of the [United States](http://www.forbes.com/places/united-states/). At least 10 different agencies are responsible for enforcing different provisions of the embargo, and according to the Government Accountability Office, the U.S. government devotes hundreds of millions of dollars and tens of thousands of man hours to administering the embargo each year.¶ At the [Miami](http://www.forbes.com/places/fl/miami/) [International](http://www.forbes.com/international/) Airport, visitors arriving from a Cuban airport are seven times more likely to be stopped and subjected to further customs inspections than are visitors from other countries. More than 70 percent of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control inspections each year are centered on rooting out smuggled Cuban goods even though the agency administers more than 20 other trade bans. Government resources could be better spent on the enforcement of other sanctions, such as illicit drug trade from [Columbia](http://www.forbes.com/places/sc/columbia/), rather than the search for contraband cigars and rum. At present, the U.S. is largely alone in restricting access to Cuba. The embargo has long been a point of friction between the United States and allies in Europe, South America, and Canada. Every year since 1992, the U.S. has been publically condemned in the United Nations for maintaining counterproductive and worn out trade and migration restrictions against Cuba despite the fact that nearly all 5,911 U.S. companies nationalized during the Castro takeover have dropped their claims.¶ Moreover, since Europeans, Japanese, and Canadians can travel and conduct business in Cuba unimpeded, the sanctions are rather toothless. The State Department has argued that the cost of conducting business in Cuba is only negligibly higher because of the embargo. For American multinational corporations wishing to undertake commerce in Cuba, foreign branches find it easy to conduct exchanges.¶ Yet, estimates of the sanctions’ annual cost to the U.S. economy range from $1.2 to $3.6 billion, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Restrictions on trade disproportionately affect U.S. small businesses who lack the transportation and financial infrastructure to skirt the embargo. These restrictions translate into real reductions in income and employment for Americans in states like Florida, where the unemployment rate currently stands at 8.1 percent.

### Solvency- U.S. Economy/ Cuba

#### Lifting the embargo boosts both nation’s economy- multiple internal links

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

Still, all of this has lots of people speculating that there's a [sea change afoot in U.S.-Cuban relations](http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2012476,00.html?xid=rss-mostpopularemail), one that has the potential to not only ease travel restrictions but possibly even overturn the embargo itself. In that spirit, here are 10 reasons that lifting the embargo makes sense: 1. It's good economics. It's long been recognized that opening up Cuba to American investment would be a [huge boon to the tourism industry in both countries](http://travel2.nytimes.com/2005/11/27/travel/27cuba.html?pagewanted=1). According to the Cuban government, 250,000 Cuban-Americans visited from the United States in 2009, up from roughly 170,000 the year before, suggesting a pent-up demand. Lifting the embargo would also be an enormous boon the U.S. agricultural sector. One 2009 study estimated that [doing away with all financing and travel restrictions on U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba](http://www.peoplesworld.org/senators-confident-on-votes-to-lift-cuba-travel-ban/) would have boosted 2008 dairy sales to that country from $13 million to between $39 million and $87 million, increasing U.S. market share from 6 percent to between 18 and 42 percent.

### Solvency- Cuban Small Businesses

#### The plan spurs support for Cuba small businesses, boosts their economy

Ted Piccone [Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy] March 18, 2013 Time to Bet on Cubahttp://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/18-cuba-piccone¶

Much more, however, could be done. In his second term, Obama has a wealth of policy options available to him through executive authority that would reframe U.S. support for the Cuban people and advance U.S. national interests.¶ In his second term, the president can (and should):¶ Appoint a special envoy to open a discrete dialogue with Havana without preconditions to discuss such issues as migration, travel, counterterrorism and counternarcotics, energy and the environment, and trade and investment. Such talks could result in provisions that strengthen border security, protect Florida from oil spills, break down the walls of communication that prevent our diplomats from traveling outside Havana and help U.S. businesses export more goods, and thereby create jobs.¶ Authorize financial and technical assistance to support burgeoning small businesses and permit trade in goods and services with certified independent entrepreneurs.¶ Expand the list of exports licensed for sale to Cuba, including school and art supplies, water and food preparation systems and telecommunications equipment.¶ Grant general licenses for journalists, researchers, humanitarian organizations and others to facilitate people-to-people exchanges.¶ Remove Cuba from the list of state sponsors of terrorism, where it does not belong, allowing a greater share of U.S.-sourced components and services in products that enter Cuban commerce.

### ****Solvency- Now is Key Time****

**Now is the key time to economically engage with Cuba- the plan speeds up squo economic reforms**

Kathy Castor [U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times]special to the Times¶ May 18, 2013¶ What I learned in Cuba¶ <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>

The flight from Florida to Cuba is a little over an hour, yet the countries remain a world apart.¶ Cuba is changing, however, as I learned on my recent fact-finding visit. Cuba has embarked on meaningful economic reforms, which deserve encouragement by the United States, not continued isolation. President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry have a window of opportunity to engage and encourage reform in Cuba and should act now.¶ Cuba has instituted significant changes to its economy through decentralization and some private ownership of property and private business, such as restaurants (*paladares*), private lodging (*casas particulares*), construction and other self-created small businesses (*cuentapropistas*). Reforms also are also under way in Cuba's agricultural sector.¶ ¶ I met with several Cubans who now work for themselves and are creating employment opportunities for other Cubans, which increases autonomy and self-determination. Cuba's decision to eliminate most travel restrictions is modestly increasing mobility, earning power and the ability to provide financial support for their families.¶ These developments remind me of the historic economic changes since the 1980s in the former Soviet bloc countries, and in China and Vietnam over the past 25 years. Indeed, I traveled to the former East Germany and Czechoslovakia in 1990 after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Velvet Revolution. The United States was directly engaged with those nations during their transition, and Americans were free to travel and interact with their people. American legal and economic experts and businesses directly aided the transition to greater freedom and personal economic opportunity.¶ If America officially acknowledged changes under way in Cuba, it would strengthen the hands of Cubans who want these reforms to succeed, and we could encourage Cuba to go further and faster.¶ America also should capitalize on economic changes occurring outside Cuba. One of Cuba's primary benefactors, Hugo Chavez, is gone and it is unlikely that Venezuela will have the capacity to continue to provide billions of dollars in economic aid and petroleum products to Cuba. In fact, in the Tampa Bay area, I know of recent immigrants who cite the fear of losing Venezuelan support and returning to another "special period" as their reason for leaving the island.

### Solvency- Agriculture Exports

#### The plan would boost agricultural exports to Cuba- key market for the Ag industry

[ROBERTA WOOD](http://www.peoplesworld.org/new-biography-3) [Roberta Wood has served as Secretary Treasurer of the Communist Party since 2007. A lifelong rank and file union activist, Roberta co-founded the steelworker women's caucus in the in the Chicago/Gary district of the Steelworkers union]¶ July 14 2010¶ Senators confident on votes to lift Cuba travel ban¶ <http://www.peoplesworld.org/senators-confident-on-votes-to-lift-cuba-travel-ban/>

"It makes no sense to punish the American people by restricting their right to travel simply because our country is trying to punish the Cuban government, said Dorgan. "Just as has been our policy with China, Vietnam and other communist countries, we should allow Americans to travel freely to Cuba."¶ The expression of optimism from the two senators followed the passage in the House Agriculture Committee of HR 4645. The bill deals not only with travel restrictions, but barriers to trade as well. It appears that it is the impact on trade that is creating the strongest pressure on representatives from agricultural states to remove barriers to trade with Cuba. Before the 50-year-old embargo, that country was the seventh biggest customer for U.S. exports.¶ For example, Wyoming's entire congressional delegation has signed on in support of the proposed legislation. With a population of only about half a million, Wyoming is a small state, but with two senators and a member of Congress, it wields disproportionate voting power.¶ "This bill is a common-sense step that rights agriculture policies which in the past have made it difficult for farmers and producers to sell their products in Cuba," said Wyoming Rep. Cynthia Lummis, a Republican. "Wyoming's farmers and ranchers cannot afford to lose any opportunities during these challenging economic times," she added.¶ In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has made this legislation a high priority, warning congressional reps that it will monitor their votes for its "scoring" of their support for business.¶ Currently food exports to Cuba are not banned, but restrictions under the 2000 Trade Sanctions Reform Act (TSRA) make trade convoluted and costly.¶ The normal procedure for international trade is for payments to be made directly from the bank of the purchaser to that of the seller. The payment is typically made just before unloading the goods at the purchaser's port. However, TSRA does not allow Cuba-bound food and medical supplies even to leave U.S. ports until payment is received.¶ And receiving that payment is not easy. TSRA requires that the payment from the Cuban bank go to a bank in a third country (which, being a bank, charges a fee of course) before going to the U.S. bank of the supplier. With that extra cost, time and red tape, U.S. goods are less appealing to their potential Cuban customer than those of their competitors in the world market, U.S. business people complain.¶ John J. Wilson, representing Dairy Farmers of America, testified before the House Agricultural Committee in favor of expanding agricultural trade to Cuba. "Cuba is a market where we should be a natural preferred seller due to our strong proximity advantanges," he stated," but regulatory hurdles imposed by our own government have thwarted our ability to best supply this market."¶ Wilson cited a 2009 study that found that doing away with all financing and travel restrictions on U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba would have boosted 2008 dairy sales to that country from $13 million to between $39 and $87 million, increasing U.S. market share from 6 percent to between 18 and 42 percent.

### A2 Corruption

#### The economic benefits for the Cuban people outweigh the risks of corruption

[DAMIEN CAVE](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/damien_cave/index.html) [foreign correspondent for The New York Times, he covers Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean.¶ From 2008 to 2010 he served as the Times’ Miami bureau chief, writing on a range of topics] ¶ November 19, 2012¶ Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo¶ <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>

Owners of Cuba’s small businesses, mostly one-person operations at this point, say they know that the government would most likely find ways to profit from wider economic relations with the United States. The response to the informal imports that come from Miami in the suitcases of relatives, for instance, has been higher customs duties.¶ Still, in a country where Cubans “resolve” their way around government restrictions every day (private deals with customs agents are common), many Cubans anticipate real benefits should the United States change course. Mr. López, a meticulous mechanic who wears plastic gloves to avoid dirtying his fingers, said legalizing imports and investment would create a flood of the supplies that businesses needed, overwhelming the government’s controls while lowering prices and creating more work apart from the state.

## \*\*\*Democracy Adv\*\*\*

### Impact Ext- War

Empirically proven- prevents worst wars

Thomas C. Wingfield, Director for Tyranny, Democracy and Regime Change, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, “The Convergence of Traditional Theory and Modern Reality: Just War Doctrine and Tyrannical Regimes,” AVE MARIA LAW REVIEW v. 2, Spring 2004, p. 111.

The dichotomy between democracies and tyrannies is more than just academic. The lion's share of international pathologies which the United States and the other civilized nations of the world have consistently opposed correlate almost perfectly with tyranny. The best known of these pathologies is war itself, and the concept of the democratic peace - that democracies do not attack each other and attack non-democracies only when mortally threatened - has received broad acceptance in academic and government circles, and holds up well under close statistical scrutiny. Although the research on the topic is voluminous, one example provides a clear snapshot. In a recent lecture, Professor Moore cited research categorizing the twenty-eight wars (more than 1,000 casualties) in the twentieth century, finding twenty-five started by tyrants, two ambiguous cases (India versus Bangladesh and Turkey versus Cyprus), and one started by democracies (France versus Britain in the Suez, 1956). n51 The author disagrees with the last, in that the conflict was precipitated by Nasser and his seizure of the Suez Canal. The two ambiguous cases are likewise poor counterexamples, in that they reflect the actions of immature proto-or pseudo-democracies. In any case, even this study found that 99.6 percent of casualties in twentieth century war were the result of tyrant-initiated conflicts. n52

### Impact Ext- Environment

#### Democratic decisionmaking is best for the environment, spreads risks proportionately and includes more voices into the equation

[Akash Goreeba](http://www.e-ir.info/author/akash-goreeba/) [writing for E-International Relations, an online resource and news outlet for global affairs] [Environmental Democracy? Does Anyone Really Care?](http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/) October 26, 2012

<http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/>

It is not surprising that EU policy has placed emphasis on just sustainability a year after and EU governance white paper was produced (2001). In this White Paper, ‘’the modernization of European governance is seen as a necessary precondition for European integration through a process of decentralization, combating the impact of globalization, and a restoration of faith in democracy through wider involvement in decision making’’ (Agyeman & Evans 2004, p.162).¶ We have seen from the above the problematic of environmental justice. It is arguably particularly difficult when considered in the global context. It is not surprising that attempts to safeguard and provide environmental justice have now taken a small scale dimension. An example of a more small scale attempt at addressing the effects on environmental justice/injustice is the Environmental Justice Showcase Community by the EPA (environmental protection agency). Recently it was announced that the State of Jacksonville USA had been selected for the pilot scheme which would see a cash injection of over $100,000 by the EPA which would go towards addressing the environmental issues suffered by low income and minority communities.¶ ‘’EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson announced that, under the initiative, Jacksonville will be one of the national models for EPA’s commitment to EJ efforts. EJ refers to the disproportionate environmental burdens placed on low-income and minority communities’’ (EPA News Release, 04/2010). The project aims at working with the likes of schools, community organisations, local residents, as well as federal agencies. Greg Strong, Florida Department of Environmental Protection’s Northeast District Director stated that ‘’we can achieve much more collectively, when we combine and leverage our resources, than as stand-alone organizations working independently… This kick-off event is an excellent way for us to find new opportunities to work collaboratively with our partners in order to benefit the local community and further improve human health and the environment’’(EPA News Release, 04/2010).¶ Those such as the EJF (Environmental Justice Foundation) have already done well to illustrate the usefulness of small scale local and community projects aimed at addressing environmental injustices, the EJF essentially operates via providing film and advocacy training and empowering ‘’local’’ communities. Some notable examples where this has been successful include the Cambodian Fisheries Action Coalition Team, or (FACT). The Team aimed to resolve conflicts over freshwater fisheries, in short the EJC ‘’ trained and equipped FACT with essential cameras, computer equipment, internet access and GPS systems. And thereby helped FACT gather essential information and testimonies and co-produced ‘Feast or Famine’, which was launched at a meeting hosted by the UK Ambassador to Cambodia and attended by World Bank, IMF and other representatives of the donor community, helping to put the issues firmly on the political agenda’’ (EJF 2010).¶ Other examples include the EJF’s ‘’educating on nature in Vietnam’’, ‘’CEDAC’’ aimed at reducing the use of deadly pesticides in Cambodia, and ‘’JALA’’ aimed at combating illegal fishing and helping poor fisherman in Sumatra. All the examples above have in common that they operated in the ‘’local’’ communities. Perhaps it is the case that both democracy and justice are best implemented at a local level.¶ We have looked at the importance as well as the problematic nature of environmental democracy and justice. As problematic as the two are, their importance are undeniable. There are numerous organisations and NGO’s that are dedicated to ensuring environmental democracy and justice, some of which have been discussed above. In a world where we are witnessing environmental degradation and problems globally, effective democracy and justice is a necessity.¶ Good environmental governance equates to good environmental democracy/justice. We have seen how minorities have suffered disproportionate environmental dis-benefits. In a supposed free world it is only fair that everyone should be allowed to experience both the risks and benefits associated with the environment, as well as future generations to come. And whilst from the above it is clear that environmental democracy/justice has a long way to go, it has done well so far to deal with many environmental issues globally, usually small scale and local. But it is undoubtedly the case that small scale localised efforts are most effective. It remains to be seen whether implementation of small scale localised agendas ‘’globally’’ will prove fruitful. And whilst the likes of Agyeman above, have argued that the majority of environmental issues ‘’fail to register a signal’, this is undeniably changing. Thanks to the efforts of the many who go out of their way to make consideration for the environment a key part of modern life.

### Impact Ext- Environment

The result of unchecked environmental destruction is extinction

Chris Hedges [Chris Hedges, whose column is published Mondays on Truthdig, spent nearly two decades as a foreign correspondent in Central America, the Middle East, Africa and the Balkans. He has reported from more than 50 countries and has worked for The Christian Science Monitor, National Public Radio, The Dallas Morning News and The New York Times, for which he was a foreign correspondent for 15 years. Hedges was part of the team of reporters at The New York Times awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 2002 for the paper’s coverage of global terrorism. He also received the Amnesty International Global Award for Human Rights Journalism in 2002]7/19/2010 (American Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, and war correspondent specializing in American and Middle Eastern politics and societies. ) "Calling All Future Eaters." http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/calling\_all\_future-eaters\_20100719/

The human species during its brief time on Earth has exhibited a remarkable capacity to kill itself off. The Cro-Magnons dispatched the gentler Neanderthals. The conquistadors, with the help of smallpox, decimated the native populations in the Americas. Modern industrial warfare in the 20th century took at least 100 million lives, most of them civilians. And now we sit passive and dumb as corporations and the leaders of industrialized nations ensure that climate change will accelerate to levels that could mean the extinction of our species. Homo sapiens, as the biologist Tim Flannery points out, are the “future-eaters.” In the past when civilizations went belly up through greed, mismanagement and the exhaustion of natural resources, human beings migrated somewhere else to pillage anew. But this time the game is over. There is nowhere else to go. The industrialized nations spent the last century seizing half the planet and dominating most of the other half. We giddily exhausted our natural capital, especially fossil fuel, to engage in an orgy of consumption and waste that poisoned the Earth and attacked the ecosystem on which human life depends. It was quite a party if you were a member of the industrialized elite. But it was pretty stupid. Collapse this time around will be global. We will disintegrate together. And there is no way out. The 10,000-year experiment of settled life is about to come to a crashing halt. And humankind, which thought it was given dominion over the Earth and all living things, will be taught a painful lesson in the necessity of balance, restraint and humility. There is no human monument or city ruin that is more than 5,000 years old. Civilization, Ronald Wright notes in “A Short History of Progress,” “occupies a mere 0.2 percent of the two and a half million years since our first ancestor sharpened a stone.” Bye-bye, Paris. Bye-bye, New York. Bye-bye, Tokyo. Welcome to the new experience of human existence, in which rooting around for grubs on islands in northern latitudes is the prerequisite for survival. We view ourselves as rational creatures. But is it rational to wait like sheep in a pen as oil and natural gas companies, coal companies, chemical industries, plastics manufacturers, the automotive industry, arms manufacturers and the leaders of the industrial world, as they did in Copenhagen, take us to mass extinction? It is too late to prevent profound climate change. But why add fuel to the fire? Why allow our ruling elite, driven by the lust for profits, to accelerate the death spiral? Why continue to obey the laws and dictates of our executioners? The news is grim. The accelerating disintegration of Arctic Sea ice means that summer ice will probably disappear within the next decade. The open water will absorb more solar radiation, significantly increasing the rate of global warming. The Siberian permafrost will disappear, sending up plumes of methane gas from underground. The Greenland ice sheet and the Himalayan-Tibetan glaciers will melt. Jay Zwally, a NASA climate scientist, declared in December 2007: “The Arctic is often cited as the canary in the coal mine for climate warming. Now, as a sign of climate warming, the canary has died. It is time to start getting out of the coal mines.”

### Impact Ext- Environment

Empirical evidence proves democracy protects environment better

John Norton Moore, Walter Brown Professor of Law, University of Virginia, “Beyond the Democratic Peace: Solving the War Puzzle,” VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION v. 44, Winter 2004, p. 348-349.

Recent academic work, as well as the most rudimentary comparison of environmental conditions between democratic and former Communist nations, such as between East and West Germany or between France and the former Soviet Union, also evince a correlation [\*349] between environmental protection and democratic governmental structures. 27 Even the environmental failures of democratic and nondemocratic nations show the contrast - as in a comparison of the Three Mile Island and Chernobyl disasters. The former, a reactor in the United States built by private industry with a containment vessel, produced no fatalities when plant mismanagement produced a meltdown. In contrast, Chernobyl, a reactor in the former Soviet Union built by the government without a containment vessel, produced fatalities in the thousands, including about three thousand among those taking part in the clean up. Professor Feshbach's 1992 book Ecocide in the USSR 28 illustrates well the massive environmental failure of the former Soviet Union.

### Solvency- Unilateral Best

#### Unilateral removal of the US embargo solves best- trade liberalization with Cuba sparks individual liberties that foster democracy

JORGE A. SANGUINETTY [Dr. Sanguinetty is an expert on the political economy of policy reform in developing and transitional economies. As a former economic planner in Cuba, Dr. Sanguinetty has first-hand knowledge of centrally planned economies and how they can transition to more open, market-based systems. He has worked on projects in more than 20 countries]¶ April 8, 2013¶ [DEMOCRACY, DEVELOPMENT AND INSTITUTIONS](http://devresearchcenter.org/)¶ A BLOG SPONSORED BY THE DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTER¶ Who benefits and loses if the US-Cuba embargo is lifted? by Jorge A. Sanguinetty¶ <http://devresearchcenter.org/2013/04/08/who-benefits-and-loses-if-the-us-cuba-embargo-is-lifted-by-jorge-a-sanguinetty/>

The answer depends on the conditions under which the embargo is lifted. I focus on the expected distribution of benefits (and costs) between the government and the Cuban population. A unilateral move by the US Government, without any quid pro quo by the Cuban government can be expected to yield significant benefits to the official establishment with benefits of an unknown magnitude to the population at large. I posit that the magnitude of the latter depends on the degree of internal liberalization of the Cuban economy. Until Raul Castro took over, the centralized command of the Cuban economy was subject to a set or constraints arguably more restrictive than the US embargo. What I have called the internal embargo consisted in the Cuban government outright prohibition for Cubans to own enterprises, freely employ workers or trade domestically and internationally. To many Cubans, probably a majority, such constraints were the main cause of the country ´s secular economic crisis.¶ Lifting the US embargo under such circumstances was reasonably expected to yield most of the economic and political benefits to the Cuban government and limited economic and no political benefits to the population. With the recent partial economic (not political) liberalization policies implemented by Raul Castro, we can expect that the distribution of economic benefits would be more favorable to the Cuban people. Such new economic freedoms carry a dose of informal political freedoms as Cubans are able to develop relationships among themselves that were tightly constrained until recently, like freedom of assembly, to communicate, and to make transactions and agreements without the tutelage of the government. To wit, as the private sector develops because the government is forced to reduce the inflated payrolls of its enterprises, the authorities lose control on those newly liberated workers.

### Solvency- Hardliners

#### The plan empowers Cubans and disempowers Cuban hardliners

[DAMIEN CAVE](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/damien_cave/index.html) [foreign correspondent for The New York Times, he covers Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean.¶ From 2008 to 2010 he served as the Times’ Miami bureau chief, writing on a range of topics] ¶ November 19, 2012¶ Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo¶ <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>

HAVANA — “If I could just get a lift,” said Francisco López, imagining the addition of a hydraulic elevator as he stood by a rusted Russian sedan in his mechanic’s workshop here. All he needed was an investment from his brother in Miami or from a Cuban friend there who already sneaks in brake pads and other parts for him.¶ The problem: Washington’s 50-year-old trade embargo, which prohibits even the most basic business dealings across the 90 miles separating [Cuba](http://www.nytimes.com/info/cuba?inline=nyt-geo)from the United States. Indeed, every time Mr. López’s friend in Florida accepts payment for a car part destined for Cuba, he puts himself at risk of a fine of up to $65,000.¶ With Cuba cautiously introducing free-market changes that have legalized hundreds of thousands of small private businesses over the past two years, new economic bonds between Cuba and the United States have formed, creating new challenges, new possibilities — and a more complicated debate over the embargo.¶ The longstanding logic has been that broad sanctions are necessary to suffocate the totalitarian government of Fidel and Raúl Castro. Now, especially for many Cubans who had previously stayed on the sidelines in the battle over Cuba policy, a new argument against the embargo is gaining currency — that the tentative move toward capitalism by the Cuban government could be sped up with more assistance from Americans.¶ Even as defenders of the embargo warn against providing the Cuban government with “economic lifelines,” some Cubans and exiles are advocating a fresh approach. The Obama administration already showed an openness to engagement with Cuba in 2009 by removing restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban Americans. But with Fidel Castro, 86, retired and President Raúl Castro, 81, leading a bureaucracy that is divided on the pace and scope of change, many have begun urging President Obama to go further and update American policy by putting a priority on assistance for Cubans seeking more economic independence from the government.¶ “Maintaining this embargo, maintaining this hostility, all it does is strengthen and embolden the hard-liners,” said Carlos Saladrigas, a Cuban exile and co-chairman of the[Cuba Study Group](http://www.cubastudygroup.org/) in Washington, which advocates engagement with Cuba. “What we should be doing is helping the reformers.”

### Solvency- Internal Reform

#### The plan boosts internal activism and political reform increasing chances at democracy

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

2. It's good politics. Supporters of the trade embargo -- like Cuban-American Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) -- have long argued that easing the restrictions would only reward Castro for the regime's ongoing repression of political dissidents. We need to keep up the economic pressure on Cuba, so this logic goes, in order to keep pressure on the regime to do something about human rights. But there's a long-standing [empirical relationship between trade and democracy](http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=3714). The usual logic put forth to explain this relationship is that trade creates an economically independent and politically aware middle class, which, in turn, presses for political reform. It's not clear that [this argument actually holds up when subjected to close causal scrutiny](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerMukherjee_Democratization%26EconGlobalization_ARPS.pdf) (although the reverse does seem to be true -- i.e., democratic reform creates pressure for trade liberalization). Still, it's difficult to disagree with the proposition that by enabling visiting scholars and religious groups to stay in Cuba for up to two years (as the presidential order would allow) rather than a matter of weeks (as is currently the case) we'd be helping, not hurting, democracy in Cuba. First, easing the current travel restrictions would allow for far deeper linkages between non-governmental organizations from both countries, which some see as a [powerful mechanism for democratic reform](http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2001/fall_democracy_dalpino.aspx). Second, because American visitors would be staying on the island longer, scholars and activists alike would gain much better insight into where the pressure points for democracy actually exist.

### Solvency- Cuba Externalizes Blame

#### The plan undermines the Cuban government’s ability to demonize the US and blame failed leadership on America

[DAMIEN CAVE](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/damien_cave/index.html) [foreign correspondent for The New York Times, he covers Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean.¶ From 2008 to 2010 he served as the Times’ Miami bureau chief, writing on a range of topics] ¶ November 19, 2012¶ Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo¶ <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>

Other Cubans, including political dissidents, say softening the embargo would increase the pressure for more rapid change by undermining one of the government’s main excuses for failing to provide freedom, economic opportunity or just basic supplies.¶ “Last month, someone asked me to redo their kitchen, but I told them I couldn’t do it because I didn’t have the materials,” said Pedro José, 49, a licensed carpenter in Havana who did not want his last name published to avoid government pressure.¶ “Look around — Cuba is destroyed,” he added, waving a hand toward a colonial building blushing with circles of faded pink paint from the 1950s. “There is a lot of work to be done.”

### Solvency- Cuba Externalizes Blame

#### The embargo forces out avenues for democratization

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

6. It's counter-productive. Isolating Cuba has been more than ineffective. It's also provided the Castro brothers with a convenient political scapegoat for the country's ongoing economic problems, rather than drawing attention to their own mismanagement. Moreover, in banning the shipment of information-technology products, the United States has [effectively assisted the Cuban government in shutting out information from the outside world](http://www.as-coa.org/article.php?id=2525), yet another potential catalyst for democratization.

### Solvency- Engagement Key

#### The status quo ensures no democratization in Cuba- only the plan lifts the embargo undercutting the oppressive regime

[Cynthia Tucker](http://www.nationalmemo.com/cuban-embargo-has-far-outlived-its-usefulness/?author_name=cynthiatucker) [veteran newspaper journalist and Pulitzer Prize winner, is a Visiting Professor of Journalism and Charlayne Hunter-Gault Distinguished Writer-in-Residence at the University of Georgia. She is also a highly-regarded commentator on TV and radio news shows] Cuban Embargo Has Far Outlived Its Usefulness¶ April 13th, 2013 <http://www.nationalmemo.com/cuban-embargo-has-far-outlived-its-usefulness/2/>

If pictures tell the tale, Beyoncé and Jay-Z, so famous their last names need not be mentioned, had a marvelous time on their recent trip to Cuba, where they were trailed by starry-eyed fans, just as they are everywhere else they go. According to press accounts, they were forced to cut short a tour of Havana’s historic old city because they were surrounded by a swarm of thousands, and their security guards got nervous.¶ That just goes to show you that Fidel Castro’s efforts to wall off the island nation from his powerful enemy to the north have failed miserably. He and his brother have perfected the dark arts of the dictatorship — jailing dissidents, stifling protest, controlling internal news media, severely restricting travel abroad — but the lights of the outside world shine brightly through the cracks.¶ Castro’s long-running tyranny has not managed the thoroughgoing isolation of, say, North Korea, where citizens have little realistic knowledge of the rest of the world.¶ Still, Castro has his accomplices here in the United States — fanatics who would help him wall off Cuba, restrict the access its citizens have to American culture and generally thwart a hoped-for transition from dictatorship to democracy. Bizarrely, those accomplices consider themselves Castro’s biggest enemies. They have dedicated themselves to his demise.¶ Indeed, if you know about the recent trip to Cuba by America’s First Couple of Pop, you probably heard about it through the controversy ginned up by a handful of Florida Republicans: Sen. Marco Rubio and U.S. Reps. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Mario Diaz-Balart. Without waiting to investigate the trip, Ros-Lehtinen and Diaz-Balart, especially, began complaining that it was likely a violation of the antediluvian U.S. embargo.¶ As it turns out, Beyoncé and Jay-Z entered Cuba legally. They went as part of a cultural and educational exchange arranged under the auspices of a group called Academic Arrangements Abroad and approved by the U.S. Treasury Department, according to Reuters. But the Florida pols didn’t want facts; they wanted to embarrass President Obama by implicating two high-profile political supporters in something nefarious.¶ It’s the anti-Castro faction who should be embarrassed. The Cuban embargo is dumb, one of the most antiquated and least sensible federal laws remaining on the books. Enacted in the early 1960s, it is a remnant of a different time — an era of bobby socks, segregation and a serious threat emanating from the Soviet Union.¶ The Cuban embargo makes no more sense today than laws requiring white and “colored” water fountains. It is kept alive by a handful of powerful politicians of Cuban heritage, who cling to their parents’ and grandparents’ bitterness toward Castro. Many members of Cuba’s affluent classes fled the island after Castro’s 1959 revolution, when he began nationalizing private industries and strengthening ties with the Soviets.¶ His long-running dictatorship has been an economic disaster and a catastrophe for civil liberties. But with the Soviets long gone, Castro represents absolutely no threat to the United States. Further, the most promising avenue for changing Cuba lies in courting it, not cutting it off.¶ When Richard Nixon visited China in 1972, ending a 25-year breach, he did so with a similar notion in mind. China remains a Communist country. It has a totalitarian government; it restricts human rights; as a nuclear power with a huge military, it could pose a threat to the United States and its allies. Yet, no reasonable politician suggests that the U.S. government should restrict travel or commerce with China. For decades, our government has believed the best way to change China is through engagement.¶ Using that standard, President Bill Clinton sought to weaken the Cuban embargo during his term by encouraging educational and cultural exchanges. Though President George W. Bush stopped them, Obama has revived the trips. While the sensible policy would be to end the embargo, the cultural exchanges are at least a step in the right direction.

### Solvency- Engagement Key

#### Pressure fails to spur democracy- only lifting the embargo solves

Kathy Castor [U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times]special to the Times¶ May 18, 2013¶ What I learned in Cuba¶ <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>

Make no mistake, the Cuban government must improve human rights. But it is clear that the policy of the embargo and isolation over 50 years hasn't improved the human rights situation. I have met with dissidents and human rights activists. Pedro Pablo Alvarez was jailed and eventually fled to the United States. Yoani Sanchez blogs about the challenges of everyday life in Cuba. What struck me was at the end of almost all of these conversations, they told me they believe that greater engagement, not isolation, is the way to help Cubans.¶ Engagement must be handled with a long-term vision and can only be hammered out through direct negotiation between the two countries. I am more convinced than ever that America should give greater attention to its island neighbor, lift the embargo and promote greater modernization of civil society in Cuba to benefit the Cuban people. Families and businesses in America also hope for a new day.¶ There is a generational change occurring in the leadership of Cuba just as has happened in other countries around the world. America can lay the groundwork for improvement in human rights, democracy and economic change that is long overdue — if leaders in government recognize this important window of opportunity.

### Solvency- Theoretical- 1AR Ext.

#### More evidence- trade liberalization creates conditions for democracy abroad

Daniel T. Griswold [associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies.¶ Before joining Cato, he served for 12 years as editorial page editor of The Gazette — the Colorado Springs, Colorado daily newspaper]¶ January 23, 2004¶ Globalist Perspective > Global Economy Does Trade Promote Democracy? <http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=3714>

Drawing conclusions¶ Oman and the United Arab Emirates are two oil-rich Gulf States that have liberalized and opened their economies, but not (yet) their political systems.¶ A key lesson from the cross-country data is that governments that grant their citizens a large measure of freedom to engage in international commerce find it dauntingly difficult to simultaneously deprive them of political and civil liberties.¶ Doubtful protection¶ A corollary is that governments that "protect" their citizens behind tariff walls and other barriers to international commerce find it much easier to deny those same liberties.¶ Another lesson from the study is this: When debating trade policy, governments and legislatures — especially in the developed countries, such as the United States or Europe — cannot ignore the broader foreign-policy implications of trade.¶ By opening markets at home and encouraging freer trade abroad, they not only promote economic growth — but also a more humane and democratic world.¶ Free trade and globalization do not guarantee democracy and respect for human rights. But they do provide a more favorable trade wind for achieving those goals.¶ Voting for tyranny?¶ Conversely, politicians who consistently vote against more open markets at home and market-opening trade agreements with other nations need to realize the effects of their actions.¶ They are, in effect, voting to keep millions of people locked within the walls of tyranny — and millions more trapped in a partly free netherworld of half-rights, half-freedoms and half-democracy.

### Solvency- Theoretical

#### Taking steps toward democracy is key- the US has to be a democratic example

Mark Niesse July 6, 2006 [Writing for the Associated Press- “Kennedy: Jury's Out on U.S. Democracy”, http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=2278772&page=1

HONOLULU Aug 6, 2006 (AP)— The United States is not making the case for freedom, democracy and Western law to the rest of the world, Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy said Saturday. "Make no mistake, there's a jury that's out. In half the world, the verdict is not yet in. The commitment to accept the Western idea of democracy has not yet been made, and they are waiting for you to make the case," Kennedy said in an address to the American Bar Association. Kennedy, 70, said he fears many parts of the world are not yet convinced that the American form of government as designed by the framers of the Constitution guarantees a better way of life. "Our best security, our only security, is in the world of ideas, and I sense a slight foreboding," he said. Kennedy, a moderate justice who has become a key swing vote on the Supreme Court, argued that the meaning of the phrase "rule of law" must be made clear in order to spread the cause of freedom to other countries. He avoided singling out specific nations. He said the rule of law has three parts: it must be binding on all government officials, it must respect the dignity, equality and human rights of every person, and it must guarantee people the right to enforce the law without fear of retaliation. "Americans must understand that if the rules of law have meaning, such as hope and inspiration for the rest of the world, it must be coupled with the opportunity to improve human existence," Kennedy said. The United States' quest to spread freedom will only succeed if people in other countries accept the promises made by a democratic government, he said. "For us, law is a liberating force. It's a promise, it's a covenant that says you can hope, you can dream, you can dare, you can plan," he said. "We must explain to a doubting world where the verdict is still out." Kennedy, who has served on the Supreme Court since 1988, urged the attorneys in the audience to do their part to work for the preservation of basic rights and uphold the principles of the American justice system. American Bar Association President Michael Greco discussed some of the same themes as he introduced Kennedy. "Any threat to liberties and human rights in one country is a threat to the citizens of all nations," Greco said. "The most fundamental responsibility of members of the legal profession is to ensure that the law is used as an instrument to advance the basic principles of justice, fairness and equality."

# \*\*\*Critical Aff\*\*\*

### Embargo= Crushes Health

#### The embargo is directly responsible for systematically destroying the health and wellbeing of the Cuban people

[Jeffrey L. Roberg](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html#bio1) [[Jeffrey L. Roberg](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html#front) is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Carthage College] AND [Alyson Kuttruff](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html#bio2) [[Alyson Kuttruff](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html#front) graduated in 2006 from Carthage College with degrees in Political Science and German. In January 2004 she traveled to several cities in Cuba to study the impact of socialism on the Cuban economy and its political and social systems. While studying in Germany at the Humboldt-Universität zur Berlin in 2004–2005, she completed an internship with the Party of Democratic Socialism. She returned to Berlin in March 2007 for a five month internship in the German Bundestag as part of the Internationales Parlaments-Stipendium] Cuba:¶ Ideological Success or Ideological Failure?¶ Human Rights Quarterly 29.3 (2007) 779-795 [Project Muse]

Despite these positive aspects, it must be noted that the collapse of the socialist bloc in the late 1980s, coupled with the effects of the US embargo, has had a devastating effect upon the Cuban healthcare system. Some public health catastrophes, such as the outbreak of optic and peripheral neuropathy **[End Page 786]** in 1992 and 1993, are directly attributable to the US embargo.[32](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT32) The US embargo has severely limited Cuban access to medications, instruments, diagnostic tools, and vaccines, because "approximately 50% of all newly patented drugs" are developed or sold by US owned companies or their subsidiaries.[33](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT33)¶ There were 1,297 medicines readily available in Cuba prior to 1991, but only 889 of these medicines are now obtainable, with doctors' access to these drugs intermittent at best.[34](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT34) Because US-developed drugs are unavailable, a startling 80 percent of the medicines currently available in Cuba are manufactured in Cuba itself. The lack of financial resources in Cuba, however, has caused a shortage of the raw materials needed to manufacture medicines, severely limiting the number of medicines available to the public. Due to intellectual property laws, Cuba can only produce generic drugs, once again limiting the overall number of medicines available to its citizens. For the average Cuban citizen, drugs are simply not obtainable on a consistent basis, be they prescription or even just a simple tablet of aspirin.¶ Finally, beyond national access to medication, the US embargo has had serious effects on public health at the local level. It was reported in 1995 that when individuals check into the hospital, they must bring their own sheets, toilet paper, soap, and other personal items.[35](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT35) Running water and disinfectants are regularly unavailable, and blackouts are common. As stated above there is a lack of medicines, and even basic medical supplies, such as gloves, gauze, and antibacterial soap are in very short supply. Moreover, absenteeism among medical staff and theft of supplies are major problems.[36](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT36) The embargo has also limited Cuba's access to water treatment chemicals and spare parts for its water supply system, resulting in an increase in water-born diseases that doctors do not have the means to treat effectively.[37](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.trinity.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v029/29.3roberg.html" \l "FOOT37)

### Embargo= US Interest Only

#### Sanctions are measures to demonize a target regime that are anti-humanitarian and merely hurt civilians human rights. The Cuban embargo was a political ploy that serves no real purpose outside of US strategic interests

**Rizvi 5-21-13** (Haider Rizvi, The author is an award-winning journalist who is based at the UN in New York. Global Times, “US sanctions policy hurts ordinary people on all sides of dispute”, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/783255.shtml#.UagPkdI-aDl>)

It seems that Washington is either unwilling or unable to understand that it need not take punitive measures against these countries and its other perceived adversaries, but instead rely on diplomatic means to settle disputes. Nevertheless, those obsessed with the notion that sanctions could subdue other nations don't seem to understand that history and memory in many parts of the world play a significant role in shaping a political mind-set that might be more focused on collective self-esteem than economic concerns. If Iran is trying to develop a nuclear bomb for real, it must be condemned. But the US has never imposed sanctions against India, Pakistan, and Israel, which remain outside the fold of the NPT while possessing dozens, or perhaps hundreds, of nuclear weapons. These three countries have no fear of sanctions because they are close economic and military partners of the US. And Cuba, a small island nation that has no nuclear weapons, has had sanctions imposed by the US for well over half a century to no effect. On the other hand, many in the US believe the sanction policy is simply absurd because it hurts working people at home and abroad. "There is little empirical evidence that sanctions can achieve ambitious foreign policy goals," argues Robert Pape, a US political scientist who has done extensive research on the impact of sanctions. He thinks that in most cases sanctions are used by policymakers "to rescue their own prestige or their state's international reputation and rhetoric to […] demonize the target regime." He calls it the "American way of war," which "democratic leaders may sometimes adopt in order to give peace a chance and thus disarm criticism of the use of force later." Mirza cannot stomach any more. "What is going on? Who is going to benefit from this kind of policy?" he asks. The Iranian rugs he took from the US and brought back from Pakistan were confiscated by the authorities for months. "It's just going to hit the US citizens. We are just shooting our own feet without aiming properly," he says.

### Embargo= Imperialism

#### The US embargo is a form of economic imperialism disguised in the benevolent rhetoric or freedom and democracy

Terra Lawson-Remer[Assistant Professor of International Affairs and Economics at [The New School](http://www.gpia.info/?utm_source=internationalaffairs/current-students2&utm_medium=_&utm_content=internationalaffairs/current-students2&utm_campaign=Print%2B-%20), and Fellow for Civil Society, Markets & Democracy at the [Council on Foreign Relations](http://www.cfr.org/). She previously served as Senior Policy Advisor at the [U.S. Department of the Treasury](http://www.treasury.gov/). She is also currently co-director of the [Economic & Social Rights Empowerment Initiative](http://www.serfindex.org/) and chair of the University’s [Advisory Committee on Investor Responsibility](http://www.newschool.edu/acir/) (ACIR). Her research addresses opportunity and exclusion in the global economy, including: poverty and economic development, property rights, natural resources, global economic governance, fragile states, emerging economies, and rule of law and informal social norms. Terra has conducted field research in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the South Pacific] Lift the Cuban embargo. January 22, 1999¶ <http://www.yaleherald.com/archive/xxvii/1999.01.22/opinion/p10remer.html>

United States foreign policy is central to the life of every Cuban, enforcing the dearth of essentials and luxuries, from medicine to cosmetics to automobiles. With the exception of Cuba, the United States is the single largest trading partner of every Latin American country. Clearly, hacking these ties would create an economic hemorrhage in any Latin American nation. The U.S. embargo against Cuba, only mentioned in this country between glimpses of unbuttoned trousers and political cockfights, lacerates the Cuban people every day.¶ Although clothed in the rhetoric of freedom and democracy, the trade embargo is fundamentally a tool of economic imperialism. When President Bill Clinton, LAW '73, said that "the overarching goal of American policy must be to promote a peaceful transition to democracy on the island [of Cuba]," he wasn't telling the full truth. Clearly, Cuban-style democracy wouldn't qualify as "free" by most definitions. Yet other nations with far worse human-rights records, including Guatemala, China, Chile, and Indonesia, have received U.S. economic and political support despite their atrocities. Hiding behind the rhetoric of liberty in dealing with Cuba is supremely hypocritical. The real motive behind U.S.-Cuban policy is economic imperialism, not democracy.¶ American involvement with Cuba dates back to the Spanish-American War, when the United States forced Cuba to add an amendment to its constitution allowing the U.S. to intervene in Cuba's internal affairs. Political imperialism gradually gave way to economic imperialism. By the eve of the Cuban revolution, foreign corporations, with the complicity of Fulgencio Batista's repressive regime, owned the vast majority of Cuban assets. Consequently, the U.S. lent covert military support to dictator Batista from 1957 to 1959 by sending weapons and intelligence to fight Castro's rebel army. Even after the revolutionaries came to power in 1959, the CIA continued to sponsor a counter-revolutionary army within Cuba.¶ It's no wonder that in 1960, when the revolutionaries nationalized Cuba's extensive wealth, they failed to compensate U.S. companies, while corporations from nations that hadn't fought against the rebels were adequately paid. This seizure of property was the primary reason for the Cuban embargo. As Michael Ranneberger, the State Department's Coordinator for Cuban Affairs, said,"One of the major reasons for the imposition of the embargo was the Cuban Government's failure to compensate thousands of U.S. companies and individuals." In other words, the embargo is the vestige of an imperialistic policy, dating from 1901, which has been characterized by U.S.-backed dictators and the Bay of Pigs fiasco.¶ Now that the "democracy defense" of the Cuban embargo has been exposed as a farce, what is left to defenders of the status quo policy? Cuba remains a communist nation, defying free trade laws, the trend toward global capitalism, and the U.S. corporate appetite for profit. One could say, in the rhetoric of the Cold War, that the U.S. is simply standing strong against the communist menace 90 miles from our shore. Yet it seems evident that the small island off the shore of Florida poses no security threat to the United States. More importantly, communism has been good to the Cuban people.¶ The infant mortality rate in Cuba is one of the lowest in the world (12 per 1,000 live births). Life expectancy in Cuba far exceeds that in the rest of Latin America (73.5 years as opposed to, for example, 64.3 years in Ecuador). The illiteracy rate has declined from 25 percent of the population before the revolution (mid-'50s) to 4 percent in the mid-'90s. It's important to note that all this was achieved without the support of the U.S., the World Bank, or the International Monetary Fund. Perhaps Soviet support until 1989 compensated for the lack of global financial involvement—but it's doubtful. More importantly, Cuban farm workers now have access to potable water, decent housing, education, and health care at a rate almost unparalleled in the rest of Latin America. Before the revolution, Cuba had a higher GNP, but it was concentrated in the hands of the very rich. Today the wealth of Cuba benefits every Cuban.¶ Cuba is not an island paradise. Although the Cuban people have, on the whole, benefited from communism, the system is currently close to collapse. This is due primarily to the loss of its largest trading partner, the USSR, as well as to inherent economic inefficiencies. The lack of a free democracy in Cuba also remains an important issue—it's impossible to support a system that denies full freedom to its citizenry.¶ So what stance should the U.S. take toward Cuba? If we are truly interested in freedom, democracy, and prosperity, we must consider the best interests of the Cuban people. In order to regain prosperity and establish democracy, Cuba must make the transition from a state-planned economy under Castro to a market economy under a democratic government. This cannot happen as long as Castro and communism are synonymous with anti-imperialism—and they will remain synonymous as long as the embargo is in place. Cuba will need the help of economists in order to find a non-capitalist alternative to communism. While laissez-faire capitalism would wipe out all the gains achieved under communism, a non-capitalist market economy could create prosperity without poverty. It's time to eschew the hackneyed rhetoric extolling the virtues of capitalism, admit that communism has been far more beneficial to the majority of Cubans than rampant capitalism was before the revolution, and lift the Cuban embargo.

### Embargo= Imperialism

#### US policy towards Cuba is rooted in neo-colonialist violence that seeks to subjugate the island nation for political and economic gain

Salim Lamrani [La Sorbonne University, Paris- Dr. Lamrani is a lecturer at the Paris Sorbonne-Paris IV and Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée Universities and specialist in Cuba-US relations.¶ U.S. Economic sanctions against Cuba: objectives of an imperialist policy¶ [cached May 31, 2013] <http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Caribbean/USEconomicSanctions_Cuba.html>

After the collapse of Napoleon's empire, the Monroe doctrine came into the world. It stipulated that the United States would on no account accept European interventions in the affairs of the American hemisphere. It would enable the northern giant to establish its power on the whole continent without hindrance, since Europe would not interfere. The theory was first motivated by Russian designs on Oregon and by the will to prevent any reconquest of the young Latin American republics by European nations. The Monroe doctrine ­ one of the founding principles of U.S. foreign policy ­ had imperialist and hegemonic aims. With the Roosevelt Corollary, its scope was later extended to encompass a diversity of situations. Economic factors had a primary role in the search for new markets. The birth of an industrial nation and the rapid increase in the production of goods entailed the need to conquer new territories. Because of its strategic position if the Gulf of Mexico and despite the failure of the various attempts to buy the island to Spain, Cuba was in the U.S. line of sight . In 1890, U.S. investments in Cuba amounted to $50 million and 7% of U.S. foreign trade was with the island. Spain spent $7 million on Cuban imported goods whereas U.S. imports from the archipelago amounted to $61 million. U.S. economic interests entailed the need for the U.S. to closely control the Cuban market in order to protect U.S. investments . The main objective of U.S. intervention in the Cuban war of independence against Spain in 1898 was to prevent Cuban revolutionaries to gain their sovereignty. Indeed, in January 1896, the captain-general of the island Martínez Campos, who was in charge of military Spanish operations, resigned, admitting that he was powerless to stop the rebels who had managed to infiltrate into the distant province of Pinar Del Río, at the extreme West of Cuba. In talks with Spain in June 1896, the United States put forward the possibility of granting Cuba home rule status. This idea aimed at ruining the independence movement and infuriated Maceo ­ second-in-command of the Cuban army of independence ­ who flatly turned down the idea . Although the Spanish army outnumbered Cuban freedom fighters and despite its overwhelming material superiority, Cuban rebels were winning one victory after another and their prestige among the Cuban population and the Latin-American public was growing day by day. The Russian ambassador in La Havana wrote to his counterpart in Spain that "the cause of Spain [was] lost" . In the same way, Colonel Charles E. Akers, the London Times correspondent, wrote: "With an army of 175,000 men, all kinds of equipment in unlimited quantity, a beautiful weather, no or few diseases, with everything working in his favor, General Weyler was unable to defeat the rebels. " Máximo Gómez, commandant of the Cuban revolutionaries, declared on March, 1, 1898: "the enemies are crushed and retreating and when they had the opportunity to do something, they didn't do anything."  This was exactly at that time that the United States decided to intervene, when Spain was put to rout. The U.S. wanted to despoil the Cuban people of its independence, an independence that had been conquered with machetes. U.S. Democrat Senator from Virginia John W. Daniel accused the U.S. government of intervening to prevent a Spanish defeat: "When the most favorable time for a revolutionary victory and the most unfavorable time for Spain came the United States Congress is asked to put the U.S. army into the hands of the President to forcibly impose an armistice between the two parties, one of them having already surrendered." The armistice was signed on December, 10, 1898 in Paris, by the United States and Spain. The Cubans were excluded from the talks. The vile Platt amendment ­ that was later repealed in 1934 after the United States started to rule over the whole political and economic life of Cuba ­ shattered the hopes of Cubans. The United States replaced Spain in the role of the colonizer, a role decadent Spain could not take on anymore. After they had suffered from Spanish colonialism, Cubans were to endure U.S. neo-colonialism and their northern neighbor was going to "build an empire at the expense of Spain" . On January, 1st, 1899, after the Spanish troops had left, the Stars and Stripes ­ not the Cuban flag ­ was hoisted in the sky of La Havana. The ripe fruit had at last fallen into the hands of the United States . After it had taken hold of almost all sectors of the Cuban economy, the United States intervened several times to maintain the status quo, notably in 1912, 1917 and 1933 when protests were repressed in a bloodbath. Before the 1959 revolution, U.S. companies owned 80% of services, mines, ranches and oil refineries, 40% of the sugar industry and 50% of railways . The Batista regime enjoyed Washington benevolence because it wonderfully served U.S. economic interests. Cuba had to wait until 1959 to taste the fruit of independence that had been forbidden to its people for almost half a millennium. But again Cuba would have to pay the highest possible price for this slap in the face of its lifelong neighbor, an affront that would not be forgiven. And what price! The total blockade of the island imposed on February, 7, 1962 violates international conventions and runs counter to the most basic juridical principles. Its main objective is to re-establish U.S. neo-colonial domination over Cuba, using starvation as a political weapon against the Cuban people. The arguments justifying this economic state of siege varied according to time. During the Cold War, the "communist threat" that Cuba represented was the paradigm in use although any serious study would smash this theory to pieces. Indeed, in 1959, there was no Soviet presence in Cuba. But Washington stuck to that interpretation: Cuba represented a threat for U.S. national security and Kennedy urged Mexico to back them up in their policy of hostility towards Cuba. But the answer of a Mexican diplomat was not long in coming: "If we publicly declare that Cuba is a threat to our security, forty million Mexicans will die laughing". The Cold War context, used for thirty years as a pretext legitimizing U.S. animosity towards Cuba, was actually a fraud since there are no facts to support this theory. If there had been any foundations to this thesis, the United States would have normalized its relations with Cuba after the collapse of the Soviet bloc. Instead of that, Washington launched a new and more serious wave of economic sanctions with the Torricelli Act in 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act in 1996. As the ancient paradigm departed this life in 1991, a new one was created. Now it is no more about containing communism but about "re-establishing democracy" in Cuba, a "democracy" devoted to the interests of Washington. No matter if it is ruled by a clone of Gerardo Machado or Fulgencio Batista: what's important is that it should make of its subordination to the United States its main virtue.  The economic sanctions imposed on the Cuban people are condemned by almost all countries in the international community and, for twelve years running, by their overwhelming majority. Nonetheless, not an ounce of change in U.S. foreign policy towards Cuba stands out on the horizon, driving international opinion to despair. Below is a table summing up the successive votes since 1992: Number of countries opposing the blockade Number of countries against the end of the blockade  Countries voting against the end of the blockade 1992 59 3 United States, Israel, Romania 1993 88 4 United States, Israel, Albania, Paraguay 1994 101 2 United States, Israel 1995 117 3 United States, Israel, Uzbekistan 1996 137 2 United States, Israel 1997 147 3 United States, Israel, Uzbekistan 1998 157 3 United States, Israel, Marshall Islands 1999 155 2 United States, Israel 2000 167 3 United States, Israel, Marshall Islands 2001 167 3 United States, Israel, Marshall Islands 2002 173 3 United States, Israel, Marshall Islands 2003 179 3 United States, Israel, Marshall Islands The only objectives of the United States are to send Cuba back to the pangs and torments afflicting Third World nations and which it has dared to escape; to plunder its resources; and to destroy its health care system considered "uniformly as the pre-eminent model for the Third World", according to the American Association for World Health . The aim of the blockade is to fulfill the wishes of Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams to incorporate Cuba into the U.S. sphere of influence and to enable foreign capital to devastate it. The logorrhea putting forward the argument of human rights problems in Cuba is only a rhetoric motivated by self-interest and designed to conceal a very clear plan: to make the Cuban people toe the line and to send it back to the destitute standards of living they were used to fret over before the triumph of the Revolution. Recently, President George W. Bush not only added Cuba to the list of terrorist states ­ a decision that should cause some mirth among the international community given that this accusation is groundless ­ but he also declared that the restrictions concerning the travels of U.S. citizens to Cuba would be made tighter. He also called for the creation of a Presidential "Commission for the Assistance to a Free Cuba", in order to repay the debt he has contracted during the 2000 election campaign with his extreme-right friends of the Cuban-American National Foundation ­ a powerful entity never reluctant to use terrorism as a tool to express political ideas . What is the truthfulness of those declarations? It is non-existent. It is easy to guess what kind of "Free Cuba" the United States wants to create: a regime that would be "more acceptable to the U.S.", as the Washington administration underlined it as soon as 1959, that is to say a nation completely obedient to its orders . Condoleeza Rice, National Security Advisor to President Bush, evoked the "intolerable case of Cuba" and this opinion is not groundless if one sees things from the point of view of U.S. political strategists . Indeed, it is "intolerable" that a Third World country ­ which is moreover in the U.S. backyard ­ dares to brave the masters of the world, intending its natural resources to be used by its people and not by Washington financial and economic interests. It is intolerable that a nation stifled by a legislative net of sanctions that would be hard to bear even for a European power, is still able to resist after 44 years of economic stifling. And there is even worse: "Social policy is unquestionably one area in which Cuba has excelled by guaranteeing an equitable distribution of income and well-being of the population, while investing in human capital", according to the report published by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) . The United States cannot tolerate this heresy. If Cuba submits to the orders of Washington, if it accepts to give up its sovereignty and to abandon its resources to the ravenous appetite of multinationals, forgetting the needs of its people on the way, it will be considered to be part and parcel of the "democratic world". But as long as it has not fulfilled those conditions, it will continue to be the target of Washington attacks. As the hero of the 1898 independence war José Martí said: "Freedom is very expensive and it is necessary either to resign ourselves to live without it, or to decide to buy it for what it's worth." And the Cubans have made their choice. As long as Cuba continues to challenge the dominant and dogmatic ideology of free market by providing an example showing that it is possible to free one's country from the distress of under-development ­ not through the implementation of the diktats of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, but by putting human beings at the center of its plans for society ­ it will be a victim of paramilitary attacks organized fron The United States. As long as it refuses to implement market and profit discipline U.S. economic terrorism will not ease off. The roots of the blockade date back not to 1959 but to the beginning of the 19th century since U.S. imperialists have always wanted to take hold of Cuba. In 1902, a U.S. bookstore distributed a map of Cuba under the title: "Our New Colony: Cuba" . The United States will do whatever is in its power to go back to that pre-revolutionary situation, to make Cuba become another Puerto Rico, Haiti or Dominican Republic, places in which the wealth of a minority stands out in sharp contrast with the poverty of the majority and where U.S. multinationals make staggering profits. It will also unflaggingly cling to the same voluble and outdated arguments that its representatives keep on repeating.

### Embargo= Crush Human Rights

#### Human rights of the Cuban people are at stake because of the embargo – their value to life and their access to basic necessities to live are at stake because of the US policy.

Hidalgo and Martinez 2000 (Vilma Hidalgo, Ph.D., is professor of macroeconomics at the University of Havana, Milagros Martínez is a Research Fellow at the University of Havana, *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 3.4 (2000) 100-120, “Is the U.S. Economic Embargo on Cuba Morally Defensible?”, Project Muse)

Costs to the Society: Whom Has the Economic Blockade Harmed? The prime victim of the economic blockade has unquestionably been the Cuban people. The blockade affects the Cuban population without regard to sex, age, race, religion, political creed, or social position, not only because it attacks basic means of living but also because it undermines the possibility of intellectual development and the spiritual well-being of the Cuban family. In this essay we shall focus on three important and sensitive aspects of the harm caused to Cuban families by the blockade: the food supply, health, and the negative consequences felt by women in Cuba. We shall stress the impact that economic sanctions have had in heightening the crisis during the nineties. For the moment we do not delve into other dimensions of the problem, which may be less visible but are no less relevant, such as the effect on education, culture, scientific activity, and quality of life, as well as a more personal impact felt by sectors of the population such as children and the elderly. In our effort to present an objective analysis we have often relied on quantifying the most tangible effects from an economic perspective, yet even so it has not been possible to evoke the full effect of the havoc wrought by each of the factors described in the preceding section as a function of ensuring adequate food supplies and levels of health among the population. Moreover, the toll in terms of human suffering cannot be quantified nor estimated, and consequently we shall allow the historic events themselves to bear witness to what has transpired, running the risk perhaps that the anecdotal nature of the events reported may seem to render our analysis simplistic.

### Embargo= Crush Human Rights

#### Political jockeying is sweeping human rights issues under the rug in Cuba through the US embargo policy

**Bandow 2012** (Doug Bandow is a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. A former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan, he is the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire.”Time to End the Cuba Embargo”, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-pointless-cuba-embargo-7834)

Cuban human rights activists also generally oppose sanctions. A decade ago I (legally) visited Havana, where I met Elizardo Sanchez Santa Cruz, who suffered in communist prisons for eight years. He told me that the "sanctions policy gives the government a good alibi to justify the failure of the totalitarian model in Cuba." Indeed, it is only by posing as an opponent of Yanqui Imperialism that Fidel Castro has achieved an international reputation. If he had been ignored by Washington, he never would have been anything other than an obscure authoritarian windbag. Unfortunately, embargo supporters never let reality get in the way of their arguments. In 1994, John Sweeney of the Heritage Foundation declared that “the embargo remains the only effective instrument available to the U.S. government in trying to force the economic and democratic concessions it has been demanding of Castro for over three decades. Maintaining the embargo will help end the Castro regime more quickly.” The latter’s collapse, he wrote, is more likely in the near term than ever before. Almost two decades later, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, chairwoman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, retains faith in the embargo: “The sanctions on the regime must remain in place and, in fact, should be strengthened, and not be altered.” One of the best definitions of insanity is continuing to do the same thing while expecting to achieve different results. The embargo survives largely because of Florida’s political importance. Every presidential candidate wants to win the Sunshine State’s electoral votes, and the Cuban American community is a significant voting bloc.

### Solvency - Exts

#### Plan is key to changing this violent approach – Lifting sanctions would be a movement toward liberty and against the hardliners.

**Bandow 2012** (Doug Bandow is a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. A former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan, he is the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire.”Time to End the Cuba Embargo”, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-pointless-cuba-embargo-7834)

Lifting sanctions would be a victory not for Fidel Castro, but for the power of free people to spread liberty. As Griswold argued, “commercial engagement is the best way to encourage more open societies abroad.” Of course, there are no guarantees. But lifting the embargo would have a greater likelihood of success than continuing a policy which has failed. Some day the Cuban people will be free. Allowing more contact with Americans likely would make that day come sooner.

#### The embargo on Cuba is a militaristic posturing measure by the US that exposes the hypocrisy of United States foreign policy.

Edmonds 5-16-13 (Kevin Edmonds, Edmonds is a former NACLA research associate and a current PhD student at the University of Toronto. “Assata Shakur and Cuba – US Relations” <http://nacla.org/blog/2013/5/16/assata-shakur-and-cuba-%E2%80%93-us-relations>)

Whatever the case may be, such posturing reveals how problematic the ongoing U.S. embargo with Cuba is and the ignorance of the U.S. administration for refusing to jump into the 21st century. The United States has normalized relations with the countries of the former Soviet Union, China, Japan—and even treats North Korea and their ongoing nuclear antics in a more respectable manner than it does Cuba. Since the Cuban missile crisis, Cuba has never threatened the United States, but the reverse cannot be said. Those arguing that the U.S. government is pursuing the embargo on Cuba in the name of freedom need a reality check. It has never been about freedom, it has always been about exercising regional power and punishing the threat of revolution. There are plenty of Latin American countries such as Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Chile which saw their respective struggles for freedom cut down in a hail of U.S. sponsored bullets. Former U.S. ally and Guatemalan leader Rios Montt was just convicted of genocide—and he never appeared on the list of most wanted terrorists. If a nation is to stand against terrorism, it should strongly condemn terrorism all forms—not just the ones it finds convenient to oppose.

### 2AC Impact Ext

#### We control the root cause of all impacts – the globalization of violence has split the world into “life zones” and “death zones” with seemingly benign sovereign nations deciding on which lives count as lives through a rubric of economic rationality.

**Balibar 2004** [Etienne Emeritus Balibar, We, The People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship, pg. 126-29]

I am aware of all these difficulties, but I would maintain that a reality lies behind the notion of something “unprecedented.” Perhaps it is simply the fact that a number of heterogeneous methods or processes of extermination (by which I mean eliminating masses of individuals inas­much as they belong to objective or subjective groups) have themselves become “globalized,” that is, operate in a similar manner everywhere in the world at the same time, and so progressively form a “chain,” giving full reality to what E. PG. Thompson anticipated twenty years ago with the name “exterminism.”’3 In this series of connected processes, we must include, precisely because they are heterogeneous—they do not have one and the same “cause,” but they produce cumulative effects: 1. Wars (both “civil” and “foreign,” a distinction that is not easy to draw in many cases, such as Yugoslavia or Chechnya). 2. Communal rioting, with ethnic and/or religious ideologies of “cleansing.” 3. Famines and other kinds of “absolute” poverty produced by the ruin of traditional or nontraditional economies. 4. Seemingly “natural” catastrophes, which in fact are killing on a mass scale because they are overdetermined by social, economic, and political structures, such as pandemics (for example, the dif­ference in the distribution of AIDS and the possibilities of treat­ment between Europe and North America on one side, Africa and some parts of Asia on the other), drought, floods, or earth­quakes in the absence of developed civil protection. In the end it would be my suggestion that the “globalization” of various kinds of extreme violence has produced a growing division of the “globalized” world into life zones and death zones. Between these zones (which indeed are intricate and frequently reproduced within the bound­aries of a single country or city) there exists a decisive and fragile super­border, which raises fears and concerns about the unity and division of mankind—something like a global and local “enmity line,” like the “amity line” that existed in the beginning of the modern European seizure of the world.’4 It is this superborder, this enmity line, that becomes at the same time an object of permanent show and a hot place for intervention but also for nonintervention. We might discuss whether the most worry­ing aspect of present international politics is “humanitarian intervention” or “generalized nonintervention,” or one coming after the other. Should We Consider Extreme Violence to Be “Rational” or “Functional” from the Point of View of Market Capitalism (the “Liberal Economy”)? This is a very difficult question—in fact, I think it is the most difficult question—but it cannot be avoided; hence it is also the most intellec­tually challenging. Again, we should warn against a paralogism that is only too obvious but nonetheless frequent: that of mistaking conse­quences for goals or purposes. (But is it really possible to discuss social systems in terms of purposes? On the other hand, can we avoid reflecting on the immanent ends, or “logic,” of a structure such as capitalism?) It seems to me, very schematically, that the difficulty arises from the two opposite “global effects” that derive from the emergence of a chain of mass violence—as compared, for example, with what Marx called primi­tive accumulation when he described the creation of the preconditions for capitalist accumulation in terms of the violent suppression of the poor. One kind of effect is simply to generalize material and moral insecurity for millions of potential workers, that is, to induce a massive proletarianization or reproletarianization (a new phase of proletarianiza­tion that crucially involves a return of many to the proletarian condition from which they had more or less escaped, given that insecurity is pre­cisely the heart of the “proletarian condition”). This process is contem­porary with an increased mobility of capital and also humans, and so it takes place across borders. But, seen historically, it can also be distributed among several political varieties: 1. In the “North,” it involves a partial or deep dismantling of the social policies and the institutions of social citizenship created by the welfare state, what I call the “national social state,” and therefore also a violent transition from welfare to workfare, from the social state to the penal state (the United States showing the way in this respect, as was convincingly argued in a recent essay by Loic Wacquant).’5 2. In the “South,” it involves destroying and inverting the “develop­mental” programs and policies, which admittedly did not suffice to produce the desired “takeoff’ but indicated a way to resist impoverishment. 3. In the “semiperiphery,” to borrow Immanuel Wallerstein’s cate­gory, it was connected with the collapse of the dictatorial struc­ture called “real existing socialism,” which was based on scarcity and corruption, but again kept the polarization of riches and poverty within certain limits. Let me suggest that a common formal feature of all these pro­cesses resulting in the reproletarianization of the labor force is the fact that they suppress or minimize the forms and possibilities of representa­tion of the subaltern within the state apparatus itself, or, if you prefer, the possibilities of more or less effective counterpower. With this remark I want to emphasize the political aspect of processes that, in the first in­stance, seem to be mainly “economic.” This political aspect, I think, is even more decisive when we turn to the other scene, the other kind of result produced by massive violence, although the mechanism here is extremely mysterious. Mysterious but real, unquestionably. I am thinking of a much more destructive tendency, destructive not of welfare or traditional ways of life, but of the social bond itself and, in the end, of “bare life.”’6 Let us think of Michel Foucault, who used to oppose two kinds of politics: “Let live” and “let die.”’7 In the face of the cumulative effects of different forms of extreme violence or cruelty that are displayed in what I called the “death zones” of humanity, we are led to admit that the current mode of production and reproduction has become a mode of production for elimination, a reproduction of populations that are not likely to be productively used or exploited but are always already superfluous, and therefore can be only eliminated either through “political” or “natural” means—what some Latin American sociologists provocatively call poblacion chatarra, “gar­bage humans,” to be “thrown” away, out of the global city.’6 If this is the case, the question arises once again: what is the rationality of that? Or do we face an absolute triumph of irrationality? My suggestion would be: it is economically irrational (because it amounts to a limitation of the scale of accumulation), but it is politically rational—or, better said, it can be interpreted in political terms. The fact is that history does not move simply in a circle, the circular pattern of successive phases of accumulation. Economic and political class struggles have already taken place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the result of limiting the possibilities of exploitation, creating a balance of forces, and this event remains, so to speak, in the “memory” of the sys­tem. The system (and probably also some of its theoreticians and politi­cians) “knows” that there is no exploitation without class struggles, no class struggles without organization and representation of the exploited, no representation and organization without a tendency toward political and social citizenshipg. This is precisely what current capitalism cannot afford: there is no possibility of a “global social state” corresponding to the “national social states” in some parts of the world during the last century. I mean, there is no political possibility. Therefore there is politi­cal resistance, very violent indeed, to every move in that direction. Tech­nological revolutions provide a positive but insufficient condition for the deproletarianization of the actual or potential labor force. This time, di­rect political repression may also be insufficient. Elimination or exter­mination has to take place, “passive,” if possible, “active” if necessary; mutual elimination is “best,” but it has to be encouraged from outside. This is what allows me to suggest (and it already takes me to my third question) that if the “economy of global violence” is not functional (because its immanent goals are indeed contradictory), it remains in a sense teleological: the “same” populations are massively targeted (or the reverse: those populations that are targeted become progressively assimi­lated, they look “the same”). They are qualitatively “deterritorialized,” as Gilles Deleuze would say, in an intensive rather than extensive sense: they “live” on the edge of the city, under permanent threat of elimination; but also, conversely, they live and are perceived as “nomads,” even when they are fixed in their homelands, that is, their mere existence, their quantity, their movements, their virtual claims of rights and citizenship are per­ceived as a threat for “civilization.” In the End, Does “Extreme Violence” Form a “Global System”? Violence can be highly “unpolitical”—this is what I wanted to suggest— but still form a system or be considered “systematic” if its various forms reinforce each other, if they contribute to creating the conditions for their succession and encroachment, if in the end they build a chain of “human(itarian) catastrophes” where actions to prevent the spread of cruelty and extermination, or simply limit their effects, are systematically obstructed. This teleology without an end is exactly what I suggested calling, in the most objective manner, “preventive counterrevolution” or, better perhaps, “preventive counterinsurrection.” It is only seemingly “Hobbesian,” since the weapon used against a “war of all against all” is another kind of war (Le Monde recently spoke about Colombia in terms of “a war against society” waged by the state and the Mafiosi together).’9 It is politics as antipolitics, but it appears as a system because of the many connections between the heterogeneous forms of violence (arms trade indispensable to state budgets with corruption; corruption with criminality; drug, organ, and modern slave trade with dictatorships; dic­tatorships with civil wars and terror); and perhaps also, last but not least, because there is a politics of extreme violence that confuses all the forms to erect the figure of “evil” (humanitarian intervention sometimes partic­ipates in that), and because there is an economics of extreme violence, which makes both coverage and intervention sources of profitable busi­ness. I spoke of a division between zones of life and zones of death, with a fragile line of demarcation. It was tantamount to speaking of the “total­itarian” aspects of globalization. But globalization is clearly not only that. At the moment at which humankind becomes economically and, to some extent, culturally “united,” it is violently divided “biopolitically.” A poli­tics of civility (or a politics of human rights) can be either the imaginary substitute of the destroyed unity, or the set of initiatives that reintroduce everywhere, and particularly on the borderlines themselves, the issue of equality, the horizon of political action.

### A2 Imperialism Good

#### U. S. Empire is fragile

Ferguson ‘10(Niall Ferguson, MA, D.Phil.,Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, William Ziegler Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, Senior Research Fellow at Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, ―America, the fragile empire,‖ Los Angeles Times, <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/feb/28/opinion/la-oe-ferguson28-2010feb28/4>)

In the same way, the challenges that face the United States are often represented as slow-burning. It is the steady march of demographics -- which is driving up the ratio of retirees to workers -- not bad policy that condemns the public finances of the United States to sink deeper into the red. It is the inexorable growth of China's economy, not American stagnation that will make the gross domestic product of the People's Republic larger than that of the United States by 2027.As for climate change, the day of reckoning could be as much as a century away. These threats seem very remote compared with the time frame for the deployment of U.S. soldiers to Afghanistan, in which the unit of account is months, not years, much less decades.But what if history is not cyclical and slow-moving but arrhythmic -- at times almost stationary but also capable of accelerating suddenly, like a sports car? What if collapse does not arrive over a number of centuries but comes suddenly, like a thief in the night? Great powers are complex systems, made up of a very large number of interacting components that are asymmetrically organized, which means their construction more resembles a termite hill than an Egyptian pyramid. They operate somewhere between order and disorder. Such systems can appear to operate quite stably for some time; they seem to be in equilibrium but are, in fact, constantly adapting. But there comes a moment when complex systems "go critical." A very small trigger can set off a "phase transition" from a benign equilibrium to a crisis -- a single grain of sand causes a whole pile to collapse. Not long after such crises happen, historians arrive on the scene. They are the scholars who specialize in the study of "fat tail" events -- the low-frequency, high-impact historical moments, the ones that are by definition outside the norm and that therefore inhabit the "tails" of probability distributions -- such as wars, revolutions, financial crashes and imperial collapses. But historians often misunderstand complexity in decoding these events. They are trained to explain calamity in terms of long-term causes, often dating back decades. This is what Nassim Taleb rightly condemned in "The Black Swan" as "the narrative fallacy."In reality, most of the fat-tail phenomena that historians study are not the climaxes of prolonged and deterministic story lines; instead, they represent perturbations, and sometimes the complete breakdowns, of complex systems.To understand complexity, it is helpful to examine how natural scientists use the concept. Think of the spontaneous organization of termites, which allows them to construct complex hills and nests, or the fractal geometry of water molecules as they form intricate snowflakes. Human intelligence itself is a complex system, a product of the interaction of billions of neurons in the central nervous system.All these complex systems share certain characteristics. A small input to such a system can produce huge, often unanticipated changes -- what scientists call "the amplifier effect." Causal relationships are often nonlinear, which means that traditional methods of generalizing through observation are of little use. Thus, when things go wrong in a complex system, the scale of disruption is nearly impossible to anticipate.There is no such thing as a typical or average forest fire, for example. To use the jargon of modern physics, a forest before a fire is in a state of "self-organized criticality": It is teetering on the verge of a breakdown, but the size of the breakdown is unknown. Will there be a small fire or a huge one? It is nearly impossible to predict. The key point is that in such systems, a relatively minor shock can cause a disproportionate disruption.Any large-scale political unit is a complex system. Most great empires have a nominal central authority -- either a hereditary emperor or an elected president -- but in practice the power of any individual ruler is a function of the network of economic, social and political relations over which he or she presides. As such, empires exhibit many of the characteristics of other complex adaptive systems -- including the tendency to move from stability to instability quite suddenly. The most recent and familiar example of precipitous decline is the collapse of the Soviet Union. With the benefit of hindsight, historians have traced all kinds of rot within the Soviet system back to the Brezhnev era and beyond. Perhaps, as the historian and political scientist Stephen Kotkin has argued, it was only the high oil prices of the 1970s that "averted Armageddon." But this did not seem to be the case at the time. The Soviet nuclear arsenal was larger than the U.S. stockpile. And governments in what was then called the Third World, from Vietnam to Nicaragua, had been tilting in the Soviets' favor for most of the previous 20 years. Yet, less than five years after Mikhail Gorbachev took power, the Soviet imperium in central and Eastern Europe had fallen apart, followed by the Soviet Union itself in 1991. If ever an empire fell off a cliff, rather than gently declining, it was the one founded by Lenin. If empires are complex systems that sooner or later succumb to sudden and catastrophic malfunctions, what are the implications for the United States today? First, debating the stages of decline may be a waste of time -- it is a precipitous and unexpected fall that should most concern policymakers and citizens. Second, most imperial falls are associated with fiscal crises. Alarm bells should therefore be ringing very loudly indeed as the United States contemplates a deficit for 2010 of more than $1.5 trillion -- about 11% of GDP, the biggest since World War II. These numbers are bad, but in the realm of political entities, the role of perception is just as crucial. In imperial crises, it is not the material underpinnings of power that really matter but expectations about future power. The fiscal numbers cited above cannot erode U.S. strength on their own, but they can work to weaken a long-assumed faith in the United States' ability to weather any crisis.Over the last three years, the complex system of the global economy flipped from boom to bust -- all because a bunch of Americans started to default on their subprime mortgages, thereby blowing huge holes in the business models of thousands of highly leveraged financial institutions. The next phase of the current crisis may begin when the public begins to reassess the credibility of the radical monetary and fiscal steps that were taken in response.Neither interest rates at zero nor fiscal stimulus can achieve a sustainable recovery if people in the United States and abroad collectively decide, overnight, that such measures will ultimately lead to much higher inflation rates or outright default. Bond yields can shoot up if expectations change about future government solvency, intensifying an already bad fiscal crisis by driving up the cost of interest payments on new debt. Just ask Greece. Ask Russia too. Fighting a losing battle in the mountains of the Hindu Kush has long been a harbinger of imperial fall. What happened 20 years ago is a reminder that empires do not in fact appear, rise, reign, decline and fall according to some recurrent and predictable life cycle. It is historians who retrospectively portray the process of imperial dissolution as slow-acting. Rather, empires behave like all complex adaptive systems. They function in apparent equilibrium for some unknowable period. And then, quite abruptly, they collapse. Washington, you have been warned.

#### Imperialism destroys ethics by valuing security risks over collateral damage

McNally 6 (David, Professor of political science at York University “The new imperialists – Ideologies of Empire” Ch 5 Pg 92)

Yet, even on Ignatieff ’s narrow definition, in which human rights are about stopping unmerited cruelty and suffering, the crucial question is how we are to do so. What if some means to this ostensible end – say, a military invasion – can reasonably be expected to produce tens of thousands of civilian casualties and an almost certain breakdown in social order? Ignatieff ’s doctrine of human rights provides absolutely no ethico-philosophical criteria in that regard. Instead, he offers a pragmatic judgement – and a highly dubious one – that only U.S. military power can be expected to advance human rights in the zones where “barbarians” rule. But note: this is an utterly ad hoc addition to his theory. In no respect can it be said to flow from any of his reflections on human rights per se. Moreover, others proceeding from the same principle of limiting cruelty and suffering have arrived at entirely opposite conclusions with respect to imperial war. Ignatieff ’s myriad proclamations for human rights thus lack any demonstrable tie to his support of empire and imperial war. This is convenient, of course, since the chasm between moralizing rhetoric and imperial advocacy allows Ignatieff to pump out empty platitudes as if these contained real ethical guidance. Concrete moral choices, involving historical study and calibrations of real human risk, never enter the equation. So, Ignatieff can drone on about the world being a better place without Saddam, never so much as acknowledging the cost of this result: some 25,000 Iraqis killed as a result of armed conflict since the start of the U.S. invasion, and probably more than 100,000 dead as a result of all the consequences of the U.S. war.24 Nowhere does he offer any kind of calculus for determining if these tens of thousands of deaths are ethically justified. Instead, banalities about being rid of Saddam are offered up without even countenancing the scale of human suffering that Ignatieff ’s preferred course of action – war and occupation – has entailed. But then, Ignatieff shows little regard for ordinary people in the zones of military conflict. His concern is for the security of the West and of the U.S.A. in particular. Ruminating about America’s new “vulnerability” in the world, for instance, he writes, When American naval planners looked south from the Suez Canal, they had only bad options. All the potential refuelling stops – Sudan, Somalia, Djibouti, Eritrea and Yemen – are dangerous places for American warships. As the attack on the U.S.S. Cole made clear, none of the governments in these strategically vital refuelling stops can actually guarantee the safety of their imperial visitors.25

#### These claims have created a popular consciousness that routinizes mass violence in the name of survival. They portray enemies as subhuman and deserving of genocidal violence. It is critical that we reject this way of knowing.

BOGGS 2005 [Carl, Professor of Social Sciences at National University in Los Angeles, Adjunct Professor at Antioch University in Los Angeles, Imperial Delusions: American Militarism and Endless War, isbn: 0742527727, p \_\_187-188\_\_\_]

One of the more tragic parts of the U.S. war crimes legacy has been its almost total absence from the public discourse: mass media, politics, academia, intellectual life. This can be understood as the result partly of civic ignorance, partly of collective denial, partly of what Gilbert Achcar refers to as "narcissistic compassion," indifference to the suffering of others. 64 However understood, there is little question about the degree to which the horrible costs and consequences of American Empire have become largely routinized within both elite and popular consciousness; the very idea of U.S. culpability for terrible atrocities, including war crimes, human rights violations, and crimes against humanity, is generally regarded as too far off the normal spectrum of discourse to be taken seriously. Given the postwar historical record, we are dealing here with nothing less than large-scale insensitivity to mass murder. The United States has become such a dominant world superpower that its crimes are more or less invisible, that is, they appear as an integral, acceptable, indeed predictable element of imperial power. Rarely a loser in war, the United States has never had to confront the grievances of those who have been wronged. This condition is exacerbated by the phenomenon of technowar, which, since World War II, has increasingly removed any sense of immediate *personal* involvement in warfare, meaning that feelings of guilt, shame, and moral outrage that might be expected to accompany killing, and especially acts of mass murder, are more easily sidestepped, repressed, forgotten-more easily yet where such acts are carried out by proxies. Long experience tells us that ordinary people, once having completed military training, can all too often calmly plan and implement the killing of vast numbers of unknown, face-less, innocent, defenseless human beings, whether by firing missiles, dropping bombs from thirty thousand feet, shooting off long-distance artillery shells, or engaging in traditional ground combat (increasingly rare for the U.S. military). Once the enemy is portrayed as a sinister beast and monster, dehumanized as a worthless other, then the assault becomes a matter of organization, technique, and planning, part of the day-to-day routi~e~ of s.imply obeying commands, carrying out assigned tasks, fitting all acnvities .Into a bureaucratic structure. Within this universe the human targets of military action are regularly defined as barbaric, subhuman, deserving of their fate and possibly even complicit in it: Native Americans, Filipinos, Japanese, Guatemalan peasants, Koreans, Vietnamese, Iraqi, erb. As on the frontier, mass killing may be understood as necessary, a moral imperative to ensure human survival and save "civilization." Viewed accordingly, forces giving expression to racial supremacy, imperialism, and xenophobia converge with a cult of violence (like that discussed in chapter 4) to form an ideological cauldron where crimes of war may come to seem natural, logical. Within the culture of militarism, large-scale massacres, authorized and legitimated by political and military commands, take on the character of the *ordinary,* where guilt and culpability are routinely evaded.P Actions viewed from outside this culture as heinous and criminal appear rather normal, acceptable, even praiseworthy *within* it, part of a taken-for-granted world. Ethical discourses are roundly silenced, jettisoned. Surveying U.S. war crimes, one can see that taken-for-granted barbari m takes many forms: the saturation bombing of civilian populations, free-fire zones, chemical warfare, relocations, search-and-destroy massacres, the torture and killing of prisoners-all sanctioned through an unwritten code of regular military operations. In technowar especially, all human conduct becomes managerial, clinical, distant, impersonal, rendering the carnage technologically rational; individual emotional responses, including the pain and suffering of victims, disappear from view. Even the most ruthless, bloody actions have no villains, insofar as all initiative vanishes within the organizational apparatus and the culture supporting it. War managers' ideology contains specialized military/technical discourses with their own epistemology, basically devoid of moral criteria. As Gibson writes in the context of Vietnam: "Technowar as a regime of mechanical power and knowledge posits the high-level command positions of the political and military bureaucracies as the legitimate sites of knowledge."66 Here bureaucratic jargon conveniently serves to obscure militarism and its victims with familiar references to the primacy of "national security," the need for "surgical strikes," the regrettable problem of "collateral damage," and "self-inflicted" casualties. Words like "incursion" substitute for real armed attacks, "body counts" for mass slaughter, "civilian militias" for death squads. The very structure of language helps to establish a moral and political gulf between perpetrators and victims, between war criminals and the crimes they commit. In general those who plan do not kill, and those who kill are merely following orders-and they too are usually shielded from psychological immediacy by the mechanism of technowar.

#### US imperialism creates the most environmental destruction.

Buell in 2001 (Frederick, professor of English at Queens College “Globalization without Environmental Crisis: The Divorce of Two Discourses in U.S. Culture”, Pg 64 <http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.foley.gonzaga.edu:2048/journals/symploke/v009/9.1buell.html>)

The global biodiversity crisis is another multi-source crisis, created by a wide variety of local actors acting as a part of an extended global system; but the damage these actors do is to local systems, not to the biosphere as a whole. It becomes global in its accumulation not just of individual actions (primarily habitat destruction), but localized effects. Many other new global problems resemble the biodiversity crisis in being globalized through the bootstrapping of local actions and instances of local damage into a global nightmare. Many of John Bellamy Foster's [End Page 62] long list of "urgent problems" are global today, thanks to the spread of industrial systems and practices and the worldwide accumulation of small impacts this creates. These include: loss of genetic diversity, acid rain, nuclear contamination, tropical deforestation, the elimination of climax forests, wetland destruction, soil erosion, desertification, floods, famine, the despoliation of lakes, streams and rivers, the drawing down and contamination of ground water, the pollution of coastal waters and estuaries, the destruction of coral reefs, oil spills, overfishing, expanding landfills, toxic wastes, the poisonous effects of insecticides and herbicides, exposure to hazards on the job, urban congestion, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources. (Foster 11-2) But environmental crisis has taken on an even more contemporary global feel as it has begun to share in the contemporary topos of the trans(-): the evocation of the transnational, transcultural, and (a necessary part of this, though less commonly added) the transgenic. One sign is that environmental crisis has become hyperaware of global interactions occurring painfully and even riskily in real time. These days, lungs in the U.S. contract as fearfully at information about the deforestation of the Amazon as they do at disputes over national clean air standards. In 1932, Aldo Leopold complained that "when I go birding in my Ford, I am devastating an oil field and re-electing an imperialist to get me rubber"; he meant this, Lawrence Buell notes, as "a reductio ad aburdam of purist thinking" (2001, 302). Contemporary globalization, in the meantime, has institutionalized such discourse as a part of our normality, not something ridiculous. 7 It is now a staple of social justice rhetoric and global activism, as when Noam Chomsky points out that American children use baseball bats hand-dipped in toxic chemicals by Haitian women and corporations are scrutinized for their overseas labor practices. It is equally a staple of environmental crisis thought, expressed in several ways. For example, environmental imperialism by a resource-hogging, pollution-generating North is now a commonplace perception ("a baby born in the United States creates thirteen times as much environmental damage over the course of its lifetime as a baby born in Brazil, and thirty-five times as much as an Indian baby") (Hertsgaard 196); the huge environmental footprints of consumer items purchased by innocent consumers extend well across the world, as environmentalists chart these effects; and linkages between apparently innocent first world choices are exposed as having drastic effects-at-a-distance [End Page 63] (as when Theordore Roszak unhappily discovers that "the material from which my eyeglass frames are made comes from an endangered species, the hawksbill turtle" and is told that whenever he turns on a light bulb powered by nuclear energy, he is "adding to the number of anecephalic babies in the world" (Rozak 36).

#### US imperialism threatens to throw the world into deepening environmental crisis.

Foster in 6 (John Bellamy, head of the Dept of Sociology at the UO and editor of the Socialist Review, “Naked Imperialism” http://www.zcommunications.org/naked-imperialism-by-john-bellamy-foster)

"[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planetâ€”no matter how largeâ€”putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means” even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones” at its disposal." The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administrationâ€™s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled "Apocalypse Soon" in the Mayâ€“June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: "The United States has never endorsed the policy of â€˜no first use,â€™ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weaponsâ€”by the decision of one person, the presidentâ€”against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so." The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fitâ€”setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the worldâ€™s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the worldâ€™s growing environmental problemsâ€”raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuelaâ€™s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo ChÃ¡vez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the "nuclear club." Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism.

#### Colonialist experience is contextual

Bosworth 10—Honors Projects Environmental Studies Department, Macalester College (Kai, Straws in the Wind: Race, Nature and Technoscience in Postcolonial South Dakotan Wind Power Development)

I do not mean to extend these examples to all studies of indigenous environmental ¶ politics – quite the opposite. Each of these examples shows the ways in which the ¶ operation of colonialism is contextual and uneven, more than a story of colonizers and ¶ the colonized. The ongoing and uneven operation of colonialism produces conditions of Bosworth 29¶ possibility for indigenous people, but it does not determine choices for them. ¶ Furthermore, colonialism is not a monolithic set of institutions, practices, or discourses. It ¶ varies through its operation in technoscience, economics, law, social relationships, and ¶ productions of nature.

### A/T Utilitarianism

#### Unchecked foreign policy in which the ends justify the means for the purposes of strategic interests enable a perpetual state of warfare which causes cycles of violence that makes global extinction inevitable

Ahmed 2011 Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace and Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis, CMR

This analysis thus calls for a broader approach to environmental security based on retrieving the manner in which political actors construct discourses of 'scarcity' in response to ecological, energy and economic crises (critical security studies) in the context of the historically-specific socio-political and geopolitical relations of domination by which their power is constituted, and which are often implicated in the acceleration of these very crises (historical sociology and historical materialism). Instead, both realist and liberal orthodox IR approaches focus on different aspects of interstate behaviour, conflictual and cooperative respectively, but each lacks the capacity to grasp that the unsustainable trajectory of state and inter-state behaviour is only explicable in the context of a wider global system concurrently over-exploiting the biophysical environment in which it is embedded. They are, in other words, unable to address the relationship of the inter-state system itself to the biophysical environment as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration of global crises. They simultaneously therefore cannot recognise the embeddedness of the economy in society and the concomitant politically-constituted nature of economics. Hence, they neglect the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically erodes this relationship, globalising insecurity on a massive scale - in the very process of seeking security.85 In Cox's words, because positivist IR theory 'does not question the present order [it instead] has the effect of legitimising and reifying it'.86 Orthodox IR sanitises globally-destructive collective inter-state behaviour as a normal function of instrumental reason -thus rationalising what are clearly deeply irrational collective human actions that threaten to permanently erode state power and security by destroying the very conditions of human existence. Indeed, the prevalence of orthodox IR as a body of disciplinary beliefs, norms and prescriptions organically conjoined with actual policy-making in the international system highlights the extent to which both realism and liberalism are ideologically implicated in the acceleration of global systemic crises. By the same token, the incapacity to recognise and critically interrogate how prevailing social, political and economic structures are driving global crisis acceleration has led to the proliferation of symptom-led solutions focused on the expansion of state/regime military-political power rather than any attempt to transform root structural causes.88 It is in this context that, as the prospects for meaningful reform through inter-state cooperation appear increasingly nullified under the pressure of actors with a vested interest in sustaining prevailing geopolitical and economic structures, states have resorted progressively more to militarised responses designed to protect the concurrent structure of the international system from dangerous new threats. In effect, the failure of orthodox approaches to accurately diagnose global crises, directly accentuates a tendency to 'securitise' them - and this, ironically, fuels the proliferation of violent conflict and militarisation responsible for magnified global insecurity. 'Securitisation' refers to a 'speech act' - an act of labelling - whereby political authorities identify particular issues or incidents as an existential threat which, because of their extreme nature, justify going beyond the normal security measures that are within the rule of law. It thus legitimises resort to special extra-legal powers. By labelling issues a matter of 'security', therefore, states are able to move them outside the remit of democratic decision-making and into the realm of emergency powers, all in the name of survival itself. Far from representing a mere aberration from democratic state practice, this discloses a deeper 'dual' structure of the state in its institutionalisation of the capacity to mobilise extraordinary extra-legal military-police measures in purported response to an existential danger. The problem in the context of global ecological, economic and energy crises is that such levels of emergency mobilisation and militarisation have no positive impact on the very global crises generating 'new security challenges', and are thus entirely disproportionate.90 All that remains to examine is on the 'surface' of the international system (geopolitical competition, the balance of power, international regimes, globalisation and so on), phenomena which are dislocated from their structural causes by way of being unable to recognise the biophysically-embedded and politically-constituted social relations of which they are comprised. The consequence is that orthodox IR has no means of responding to global systemic crises other than to reduce them to their symptoms. Indeed, orthodox IR theory has largely responded to global systemic crises not with new theory, but with the expanded application of existing theory to 'new security challenges' such as 'low-intensity' intra-state conflicts; inequality and poverty; environmental degradation; international criminal activities including drugs and arms trafficking; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and international terrorism.91 Although the majority of such 'new security challenges' are non-military in origin - whether their referents are states or individuals - the inadequacy of systemic theoretical frameworks to diagnose them means they are primarily examined through the lenses of military-political power.92 In other words, the escalation of global ecological, energy and economic crises is recognised not as evidence that the current organisation of the global political economy is fundamentally unsustainable, requiring urgent transformation, but as vindicating the necessity for states to radicalise the exertion of their military-political capacities to maintain existing power structures, to keep the lid on.93 Global crises are thus viewed as amplifying factors that could mobilise the popular will in ways that challenge existing political and economic structures, which it is presumed (given that state power itself is constituted by these structures) deserve protection. This justifies the state's adoption of extra-legal measures outside the normal sphere of democratic politics. In the context of global crisis impacts, this counter-democratic trend-line can result in a growing propensity to problematise potentially recalcitrant populations - rationalising violence toward them as a control mechanism. Consequently, for the most part, the policy implications of orthodox IR approaches involve a redundant conceptualisation of global systemic crises purely as potential 'threat-multipliers' of traditional security issues such as 'political instability around the world, the collapse of governments and the creation of terrorist safe havens'. Climate change will serve to amplify the threat of international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources. The US Army, for instance, depicts climate change as a 'stress-multiplier' that will 'exacerbate tensions' and 'complicate American foreign policy'; while the EU perceives it as a 'threat-multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability'.95 In practice, this generates an excessive preoccupation not with the causes of global crisis acceleration and how to ameliorate them through structural transformation, but with their purportedly inevitable impacts, and how to prepare for them by controlling problematic populations. Paradoxically, this 'securitisation' of global crises does not render us safer. Instead, by necessitating more violence, while inhibiting preventive action, it guarantees greater insecurity. Thus, a recent US Department of Defense report explores the future of international conflict up to 2050. It warns of 'resource competition induced by growing populations and expanding economies', particularly due to a projected 'youth bulge' in the South, which 'will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy'. This will prompt a 'return to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting natural resources and overseas markets'. Finally, climate change will 'compound' these stressors by generating humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.96 A similar study by the US Joint Forces Command draws attention to the danger of global energy depletion through to 2030. Warning of ‘the dangerous vulnerabilities the growing energy crisis presents’, the report concludes that ‘The implications for future conflict are ominous.’97 Once again, the subject turns to demographics: ‘In total, the world will add approximately 60 million people each year and reach a total of 8 billion by the 2030s’, 95 per cent accruing to developing countries, while populations in developed countries slow or decline. ‘Regions such as the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the youth bulge will reach over 50% of the population, will possess fewer inhibitions about engaging in conflict.’98 The assumption is that regions which happen to be both energy-rich and Muslim-majority will also be sites of violent conflict due to their rapidly growing populations. A British Ministry of Defence report concurs with this assessment, highlighting an inevitable ‘youth bulge’ by 2035, with some 87 per cent of all people under the age of 25 inhabiting developing countries. In particular, the Middle East population will increase by 132 per cent and sub-Saharan Africa by 81 per cent. Growing resentment due to ‘endemic unemployment’ will be channelled through ‘political militancy, including radical political Islam whose concept of Umma, the global Islamic community, and resistance to capitalism may lie uneasily in an international system based on nation-states and global market forces’. More strangely, predicting an intensifying global divide between a super-rich elite, the middle classes and an urban under-class, the report warns: ‘The world’s middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest.’99 Thus, the securitisation of global crisis leads not only to the problematisation of particular religious and ethnic groups in foreign regions of geopolitical interest, but potentially extends this problematisation to any social group which might challenge prevailing global political economic structures across racial, national and class lines. The previous examples illustrate how secur-itisation paradoxically generates insecurity by reifying a process of militarization against social groups that are constructed as external to the prevailing geopolitical and economic order. In other words, the internal reductionism, fragmentation and compartmentalisation that plagues orthodox theory and policy reproduces precisely these characteristics by externalising global crises from one another, externalising states from one another, externalising the inter-state system from its biophysical environment, and externalising new social groups as dangerous 'outsiders\*. Hence, a simple discursive analysis of state militarisation and the construction of new "outsider\* identities is insufficient to understand the causal dynamics driving the process of 'Otherisation'. As Doug Stokes points out, the Western state preoccupation with the ongoing military struggle against international terrorism reveals an underlying 'discursive complex", where representations about terrorism and non-Western populations are premised on 'the construction of stark boundaries\* that 'operate to exclude and include\*. Yet these exclusionary discourses are 'intimately bound up with political and economic processes', such as strategic interests in proliferating military bases in the Middle East, economic interests in control of oil, and the wider political goal of 'maintaining American hegemony\* by dominating a resource-rich region critical for global capitalism.100 But even this does not go far enough, for arguably the construction of certain hegemonic discourses is mutually constituted by these geopolitical, strategic and economic interests — exclusionary discourses are politically constituted. New conceptual developments in genocide studies throw further light on this in terms of the concrete socio-political dynamics of securitisation processes. It is now widely recognised, for instance, that the distinguishing criterion of genocide is not the pre-existence of primordial groups, one of which destroys the other on the basis of a preeminence in bureaucratic military-political power. Rather, genocide is the intentional attempt to destroy a particular social group that has been socially constructed as different. As Hinton observes, genocides precisely constitute a process of 'othering\* in which an imagined community becomes reshaped so that previously 'included\* groups become 'ideologically recast' and dehumanised as threatening and dangerous outsiders, be it along ethnic, religious, political or economic lines — eventually legitimising their annihilation.102 In other words, genocidal violence is inherently rooted in a prior and ongoing ideological process, whereby exclusionary group categories are innovated, constructed and 'Otherised' in accordance with a specific socio-political programme. The very process of identifying and classifying particular groups as outside the boundaries of an imagined community of 'inclusion\*, justifying exculpatory violence toward them, is itself a political act without which genocide would be impossible.1 3 This recalls Lemkin's recognition that the intention to destroy a group is integrally connected with a wider socio-political project - or colonial project — designed to perpetuate the political, economic, cultural and ideological relations of the perpetrators in the place of that of the victims, by interrupting or eradicating their means of social reproduction. Only by interrogating the dynamic and origins of this programme to uncover the social relations from which that programme derives can the emergence of genocidal intent become explicable. Building on this insight, Semelin demonstrates that the process of exclusionary social group construction invariably derives from political processes emerging from deep-seated sociopolitical crises that undermine the prevailing framework of civil order and social norms; and which can, for one social group, be seemingly resolved by projecting anxieties onto a new 'outsider' group deemed to be somehow responsible for crisis conditions. It is in this context that various forms of mass violence, which may or may not eventually culminate in actual genocide, can become legitimised as contributing to the resolution of crises.105 This does not imply that the securitisation of global crises by Western defence agencies is genocidal. Rather, the same essential dynamics of social polarisation and exclusionary group identity formation evident in genocides are highly relevant in understanding the radicalisation processes behind mass violence. This highlights the fundamental connection between social crisis, the breakdown of prevailing norms, the formation of new exclusionary group identities, and the projection of blame for crisis onto a newly constructed 'outsider' group vindicating various forms of violence.

#### The high cost in life and liberty outweighs utilitarian concerns

Addis 2003 (Adeno Addis is William Ray Forrester Professor of Public and Constitutional Law at Tulane University Law School. “Economic Sanctions and The problem of evil”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 25.3 (2003) 573-623)

Other critics may concede that more often than not such measures would lead to the desired behavior modification, but at a cost that is often unacceptably high. Economic sanctions deprive citizens of the target state many of the basic necessities of life, leading to massive disruption and even destruction of life. The often high cost in life, liberty, and property that economic sanctions exact on innocent citizens and sectors of the target state are, to these critics, simply unacceptable even if at the end there was to be a change in the action and behavior of the regime of the target state. The moral and material costs that sanctions entail are, to these critics, simply too high to bear. Actually, there are two versions of the moral argument. The weak version is utilitarian in nature. It claims that often the cost in innocent human life and infrastructural damage is far greater than the benefit that is gained by imposing these sanctions. [13](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html" \l "FOOT13) The strong version of the moral argument is Kantian in its outlook. It objects to economic sanctions on the ground that often, if not always, sanctions target innocent civilians for suffering as a means to achieving a foreign policy objective, contrary to Kant's categorical imperative that we treat "humanity, whether in [our] person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end." [14](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html" \l "FOOT14) The argument here is that it is morally [End Page 576] unacceptable to impose suffering on innocent sectors of the target state, as economic sanctions do, for an objective that does not involve the prevention of the deaths of other innocent persons. [15](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v025/25.3addis.html" \l "FOOT15)

# \*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

## A2 Politics

### Link Turn – Plan Popular

#### Plan Popular with key members of congress

**Murray 2013** (Terrence Murray, The Financialist, 1-23-13, “The Geopolitical Agenda for 2013”, <http://www.thefinancialist.com/the-geopolitical-agenda-for-2013/>)

Cuba: A Move to Loosen the U.S. Embargo? With key members of the U.S. Congress calling for a loosening of the embargo on Cuba, and President Obama open to improving relations with the island state, Cuba could be this year’s big surprise, Clemons says. Raul Castro has approved a series of economic reforms since taking over from his brother, Fidel Castro, including a new law easing travel restrictions on Cubans. The reforms have motivated some members of the U.S. House of Representatives, including Rep. Joe Garcia, D-Fla., to call for more dialogue with Havana. Newly elected Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., has urged Washington to end the travel ban on U.S. citizens visiting Cuba. Implementing reforms like these would have positive diplomatic repercussions far beyond Cuba, says Clemons. “Cuba is a nation of 11 million people with a strong echo effect. How we deal with Cuba is a positive indication of how the U.S. is going to deal and relate with other countries that have neither large economies nor armies but are part of the often ignored middle range of nations that should matter to us.”

#### Support collapsing for the embargo now

[Ted Piccone](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/picconet) [Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy)]¶ MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT | January 17, 2013¶ Opening to Havana¶ <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/opening-to-havana>

As a result of your actions and changing demographics, families are more readily reuniting across the Florida straits, opening new channels of commerce and communication that are encouraging reconciliation among Cuban-Americans and a more general reframing of how best to support the Cuban people. Cuba’s recent decision to lift exit controls for most Cubans on the island is likely to accelerate this process of reconciliation within the Cuban diaspora, thereby softening support for counterproductive tactics like the embargo. The new travel rules also require a re-think of the outdated U.S. migration policy in order to manage a potential spike in departures from the island to the United States. For example, the team handling your immigration reform bill should be charged with devising proposals to reduce the special privileges afforded Cubans who make it to U.S. soil.

#### The plan is popular, Obama can spin it as a win

Ted Piccone [Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy] March 18, 2013 Time to Bet on Cubahttp://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/18-cuba-piccone¶

This list is not exhaustive; the president can take any number of unilateral steps to improve relations and increase U.S. support to the Cuban people, as mandated by Congress. He can also expect significant pushback from a well-organized and vocal minority of elected officials who are increasingly out of step with their constituencies on this issue. (In the 2012 election, Obama’s share of the Cuban-American vote increased by 10 points in Miami-Dade county.) He can win the argument, however, by demonstrating that these measures are in the spirit of the congressional mandate to encourage a free and prosperous Cuba.

#### Plan Popular – people encouraging Obama because of economic interests despite naysayers

**Cave 2012** (Damien Cave is a foreign correspondent for The New York Times, based in Mexico City. 11-19-12, “Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on US Embargo,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>)

Even as defenders of the embargo warn against providing the Cuban government with “economic lifelines,” some Cubans and exiles are advocating a fresh approach. The Obama administration already showed an openness to engagement with Cuba in 2009 by removing restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban Americans. But with Fidel Castro, 86, retired and President Raúl Castro, 81, leading a bureaucracy that is divided on the pace and scope of change, many have begun urging President Obama to go further and update American policy by putting a priority on assistance for Cubans seeking more economic independence from the government. “Maintaining this embargo, maintaining this hostility, all it does is strengthen and embolden the hard-liners,” said Carlos Saladrigas, a Cuban exile and co-chairman of the Cuba Study Group in Washington, which advocates engagement with Cuba. “What we should be doing is helping the reformers.”

### Link Turn – Plan Bipartisan

#### Economic engagement is bipartisan in Latin America

Luxner 2012 (Larry Luxner is news editor of The Washington Diplomat. 10-1-12, “State Official Makes Her Mark on Rising Western Hemisphere”, <http://washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8560&Itemid=414>)

In the meantime, Jacobson said the detention of Gross "has clearly stimulated a review" of USAID's pro-democracy programs in Cuba. "For years, the United States has had programs in places that were difficult and dangerous. We have a commitment to continue helping democracy activists, working with incipient civil society, but we'll do that in a way that reduces as much as possible the dangers to people working there," she said. "Some of the guidelines are different than they were before. We want to make sure people remain safe while having an impact." Despite the lack of a political opening under President Raúl Castro since he took over the leadership of Cuba from his older brother Fidel four years ago, the regime has unveiled several dramatic economic reforms. These include the birth of a private real estate market, the dismantling of money-losing state companies, and the rise of small self-employment ventures known as *cuentapropismo*. Even the government predicts that by 2015, the nascent private sector could account for up to 40 percent of Cuba's GDP, compared to less than 5 percent today. "We're watching these changes very closely," said Jacobson. "We're as riveted to the possibility of change in Cuba as everybody else. As we watch these things, the possibility for economic opening and freedom is critically important to Cubans. "The problem we have is that they're halfway measures," she argues. "Change is possible and the United States will encourage, reward and respond to change. The way we responded to change in Burma is very instructive, I think. We are not absolutists in the sense that we're going to sit with our arms folded until everything is done." Region-wide, Jacobson said the Obama administration remains focused on the same four goals as when it came into office: improving citizen security, strengthening democracy, expanding economic opportunity, and reducing social inequality. "The fundamental goal that runs throughout all of those goals is partnership," she told The Diplomat. "As the president said in Cartagena, there's really no such thing as junior and senior partnerships. What's new about that is the capacity of our partner countries to act domestically, in the region and globally. Our partnerships include Brazil, Mexico, Canada, Colombia and Chile — countries with strong democratic institutions and the capacity to really bring something to the table that the United States can't." Some of the biggest international meetings in the last year, she noted, took place in Latin America, even though they weren't specific to Latin America. Jacobson also cited a "rare moment of bipartisanship" in the recent passage of U.S. free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama. "Even the opponents of free trade recognize that not having the agreements does not improve the labor or environmental situation," she said. "Sometimes, people have irrational exuberance about what FTAs can really achieve. They're not the entire answer on labor and environment, just as they're not the entire answer in growing trade and exports. They're critically important and they help enormously, but you must also have solid domestic legislation, enforcement and sanctions if people don't abide by the rules." The next logical step, said Jacobson, is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which seeks to eliminate trade barriers across the entire Pacific region. In addition to the United States, the TPP's original members include Chile and Peru, and now Mexico and Canada have been invited to join. In addition, Panama and Colombia are interested in becoming part of the TPP as soon as possible, while Costa Rica may sign up as well. "[If] you look at U.S. Latin America policy since Bush 41, there's been a lot of bipartisanship on this hemisphere. When I go up [to Congress] and brief them over the last four years on the Mérida Initiative and CARSI [Central America Regional Security Initiative], I do not get partisan pushback."

#### Bipartisan support for ending embargo – agricultural and trade interests

Daily Kos 2009 (3-18-09, “Bipartisan Senate group take aim at cuba embargo provisions,” http://www.dailykos.com/story/2009/03/18/710102/-Bipartisan-Senate-group-take-aim-at-Cuba-embargo-provisions#)

Remember Jersey Sen. Bob Menendez's quixotic stand on behalf of regressive Cuba sanctions a few weeks ago? There he was, Senator Bob Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey, holding forth from the well of the Senate making his Alamo stand against some very innocuous provisions to allow Cuban-American family members travel to Cuba and for American agricultural producers to carry out the business they already do with Cuba more efficiently during a time of economic recession. Most analysts I speak with say this was a picture of a man trying to put his finger in a dike, knowing it was about to burst. Senator Menendez is, you see, the highest ranking Cuban American in Congress and, with the Diaz-Balart brothers and Rep. Lehtinen in the minority, the last hope for defending the embargo against Cuba in the 111th Congress. The dike metaphor is apt. Obama ran on rethinking Cuba policy, and won Florida. The Cuban-American community is itself split between the geezers still clinging to a generations-long failed embargo policy, and the younger crowd eager for change. Respected foreign policy experts are eager for a more rational Cuba policy, including Republicans like Dick Lugar. And farm state legislators from both parties are eager to open up a new market for their farmers' goods. In other words, the embargo is not long for the world, with proponents dwindling in size and relegated mostly to the minority. Hence, Menendez's last stand, protesting a technical change in the definition of "cash-based sales" of medical and agricultural goods to Cuba that the Bush Administration had implemented to effectively block such sales to the island. Menendez dropped his efforts to hold up the Omnibus after he was promised that the Bush-era definition would remain. A bipartisan group of Senators, writing Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, is now demanding that Treasury tear up any such deal with Menendez and adhere to the letter of the law: The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSRA) of 2000 authorized agricultural exports to Cuba by payment of cash in advance or third‐country bank letters of credit. For several years, until early 2005, such cash‐based sales were taking place and working well. After goods shipped from U.S. ports, the Cuban buyers initiated payments, routing them through third‐country banks, as required by the law. There were no reported instances in which a Cuban buyer took possession of U.S. goods prior to completing payment to the U.S. seller, a fact acknowledged by the Treasury Department during the confirmation hearing of Deputy Secretary Kimmitt in July 2005. Despite this fact, [the Office of Foreign Assets Control] issued a rule in February 2005 that defined "payment of cash in advance" as payment prior to shipment of goods. The change in definition has brought all cashbased sales to a halt, rendering the cash in advance provision useless and undermining Congress’s intent to facilitate agriculture sales to Cuba. Your March 5, 2009 letter stated that OFAC will continue to use this definition. This is contrary to the intention of the provisions included in the Omnibus legislation to halt this use.

#### Bipartisan support for repealing embargo – economic interests

**Litvinsky 09** (Marina, reporter for The Global Information Network, “Penny Worthy Being Saved,” Global Information Network, April 1, 2009, Proquest)

WASHINGTON, Mar. 31, 2009 (IPS/GIN) - A bipartisan group of U.S. senators and interest groups is backing a bill that would end the long economic embargo against Cuba, including travel restrictions to the island. The 'Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act' was introduced Tuesday by Senators Byron Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat and Senate Democratic Policy Committee chair, and Michael Enzi, a Republican from Wyoming. They were joined by 20 cosponsors, including influential Senators Christopher Dodd and Richard Lugar, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Human Rights Watch (HRW). "The people of Cuba ought to be free," said Senator Dorgan, pointing to the U.S.'s failed Cuba policy in achieving this. The nearly 50-year-old embargo on Cuba is only "punishing American people," he said. If passed, the bill would prohibit the president from regulating or prohibiting travel to or from Cuba by U.S. citizens or legal residents or any of the transactions ordinarily incident to such travel, except in time of war or armed hostilities between the United States and Cuba, or of imminent danger to the public health or the physical safety of U.S. travellers. The Cuban embargo, introduced in 1961 and subsequently tightened further, prohibits travel to and business dealings with Cuba for all U.S. citizens. Many have argued that this policy actually thwarts U.S. interests and further strengthens the government there. "The U.S. embargo on Cuba is a 50-year failure, and lifting the ban on travel is a good first step toward a more rational policy," said Myron Brilliant, senior vice president for International Affairs at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. "The embargo was implemented to try to bring freedom to Cuba, but it made a martyr out of a tyrant and actually has helped prop up the regime." Sponsors of the bill include agricultural associations who believe the lifting of travel restrictions to Cuba will increase U.S. agricultural sales of such commodities as poultry, wheat and soybeans. Agricultural sales to Cuba have averaged 400 million dollars annually since 2000. "In the long term we need to do more to open up channels of trade (in Cuba), like we do in other countries," said Bob Stallman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Proponents of the legislation point out that the 47-year-old embargo has done nothing to promote democracy or force the Cuban government to obey human rights standards. "Human Rights Watch has been monitoring human rights in Cuba for nearly two decades and the dismal state of human rights has not improved," said Jose Miguel Vivanco, executive director of the Americas Division at HRW

## A2 Hardliners Case Turn

### No UQ – Reformers Pushing Up

#### Now is key opportunity – generational gap

**Castor 5-18-13**, (“What I Learned In Cuba,” U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>)

Make no mistake, the Cuban government must improve human rights. But it is clear that the policy of the embargo and isolation over 50 years hasn't improved the human rights situation. I have met with dissidents and human rights activists. Pedro Pablo Alvarez was jailed and eventually fled to the United States. Yoani Sanchez blogs about the challenges of everyday life in Cuba. What struck me was at the end of almost all of these conversations, they told me they believe that greater engagement, not isolation, is the way to help Cubans. Engagement must be handled with a long-term vision and can only be hammered out through direct negotiation between the two countries. I am more convinced than ever that America should give greater attention to its island neighbor, lift the embargo and promote greater modernization of civil society in Cuba to benefit the Cuban people. Families and businesses in America also hope for a new day. There is a generational change occurring in the leadership of Cuba just as has happened in other countries around the world. America can lay the groundwork for improvement in human rights, democracy and economic change that is long overdue — if leaders in government recognize this important window of opportunity.

#### Reformers advancing economic agenda – US Recognition would strengthen efforts

**Castor 5-18-13**, (“What I Learned In Cuba,” U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, a Tampa Democrat, represents Florida's 14th congressional district, which includes Tampa and parts of St. Petersburg. She wrote this exclusively for the Tampa Bay Times. <http://www.tampabay.com/news/perspective/what-i-learned-in-cuba/2121361>)

Cuba is changing, however, as I learned on my recent fact-finding visit. Cuba has embarked on meaningful economic reforms, which deserve encouragement by the United States, not continued isolation. President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry have a window of opportunity to engage and encourage reform in Cuba and should act now. Cuba has instituted significant changes to its economy through decentralization and some private ownership of property and private business, such as restaurants (paladares), private lodging (casas particulares), construction and other self-created small businesses (cuentapropistas). Reforms also are also under way in Cuba's agricultural sector. I met with several Cubans who now work for themselves and are creating employment opportunities for other Cubans, which increases autonomy and self-determination. Cuba's decision to eliminate most travel restrictions is modestly increasing mobility, earning power and the ability to provide financial support for their families. These developments remind me of the historic economic changes since the 1980s in the former Soviet bloc countries, and in China and Vietnam over the past 25 years. Indeed, I traveled to the former East Germany and Czechoslovakia in 1990 after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Velvet Revolution. The United States was directly engaged with those nations during their transition, and Americans were free to travel and interact with their people. American legal and economic experts and businesses directly aided the transition to greater freedom and personal economic opportunity.If America officially acknowledged changes under way in Cuba, it would strengthen the hands of Cubans who want these reforms to succeed, and we could encourage Cuba to go further and faster.

### Aff Solves – Removing Sanctions Emboldens Reformers

#### Sanctions are the alibi for totalitarian crackdowns

Bandow 2012 (Doug Bandow, Doug Bandow is a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. A former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan, he is the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire, 12-11-12, “Time to End Cuba Embargo”, nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-pointless-cuba-embargo-7834

The policy in Cuba obviously has failed. The regime remains in power. Indeed, it has consistently used the embargo to justify its own mismanagement, blaming poverty on America. Observed Secretary of State Hillary Clinton: “It is my personal belief that the Castros do not want to see an end to the embargo and do not want to see normalization with the United States, because they would lose all of their excuses for what hasn't happened in Cuba in the last 50 years.” Similarly, Cuban exile Carlos Saladrigas of the Cuba Study Group argued that keeping the “embargo, maintaining this hostility, all it does is strengthen and embolden the hardliners.” Cuban human rights activists also generally oppose sanctions. A decade ago I (legally) visited Havana, where I met Elizardo Sanchez Santa Cruz, who suffered in communist prisons for eight years. He told me that the "sanctions policy gives the government a good alibi to justify the failure of the totalitarian model in Cuba."

#### Sanctions are the regime justification for crackdowns

Bandow 2012 (Doug Bandow, Doug Bandow is a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. A former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan, he is the author of several books, including Foreign Follies: America's New Global Empire, 12-11-12, “Time to End Cuba Embargo”, nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-pointless-cuba-embargo-7834

Today even the GOP is no longer reliable. For instance, though Republican vice-presidential nominee Paul Ryan has defended the embargo in recent years, that appears to reflect ambition rather than conviction. Over the years he voted at least three times to lift the embargo, explaining: “The embargo doesnt work. It is a failed policy. It was probably justified when the Soviet Union existed and posed a threat through Cuba. I think its become more of a crutch for Castro to use to repress his people. All the problems he has, he blames the American embargo.”There is essentially no international support for continuing the embargo. For instance, the European Union plans to explore improving relations with Havana . Spain’s Deputy Foreign Minister Gonzalo de Benito explained that the EU saw a positive evolution in Cuba. The hope, then, is to move forward in the relationship between the European Union and Cuba. The administration should move now, before congressmen are focused on the next election. President Obama should propose legislation to drop (or at least significantly loosen) the embargo. He also could use his authority to relax sanctions by, for instance, granting more licenses to visit the island.

## A2 Terrorism DA

### No Link – Not a Threat

#### Cuba is not a terrorist threat – engaging in peace talks

Williams 5-3-13 (Carol J. Williams, LA Times foreign correspondent for 25 years, Carol J. Williams traveled to and reported from more than 80 countries in Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America., “Political Calculus Keeps Cuba on US Terror List”, http://www.latimes.com/news/world/worldnow/la-fg-wn-cuba-us-terror-list-20130502,0,2494970.story)

Once a key supplier of arms and training to leftist rebels in Latin America, the Castro regime long ago disentangled itself from the Cold War-era confrontations. Havana now hosts peace talks between the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia that it once supported and the U.S.-allied government the insurgents battled for years. Havana still gives refuge to a few fugitive radicals from the Black Panthers and Basque insurgents, and two years ago a Cuban court convicted 64-year-old development specialist Alan Gross on spying charges for attempting to install satellite equipment without government permission. But nothing that Cuba has done suggests its government is plotting harm against Americans, national security experts say. And they criticize as counterproductive the [State Department](http://www.latimes.com/topic/politics/government/u.s.-department-of-state-ORGOV000000150.topic)’s decision, disclosed this week, to keep Cuba on its list of “state sponsors of terrorism.” “We ought to reserve that term for nations that actually use the apparatus of statehood to support the targeting of U.S. interests and civilians,” said Juliette Kayyem, a former assistant secretary for intergovernmental affairs at the [Department of Homeland Security](http://www.latimes.com/topic/unrest-conflicts-war/defense/u.s.-department-of-homeland-security-ORGOV0000136.topic) and now writing and lecturing on national security in the Boston area. “Yes, Cuba does a lot of bad things that we don’t like, but it doesn’t rise to anything on the level of a terrorist threat.” On Wednesday, State Department spokesman Patrick Ventrell said the administration “has no current plans to remove Cuba” from the list to be released later this month. The island nation that has been under a U.S. trade and travel embargo since shortly after revolutionary leader Fidel Castro came to power in 1959 is in the company of only Iran, Syria and Sudan in being branded with the “state sponsor” label. Kayyem laments the “diluting” of the terrorist designation based on political or ideological disputes. “We work with a lot of countries we don’t like, but the imprimatur of ‘terrorism’ has a ring to it in a way that can be harmful to us,” she said. Collaboration between the United States and Cuba on emergency planning to respond to the mutual threats posed by hurricanes, oil spills and refugee crises are complicated by the set of trade and financial restrictions that comes along with the “state sponsor” censure, Kayyem said. “There are some real operational impediments when we have a system that begins with ‘no’ rather than ‘why not?’ ” she said of the legally encumbered contacts between Havana and Washington. Politicians who have pushed for a continued hard line against Cuba cheered their victory in getting the Obama administration to keep Cuba on the list. U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a South Florida Republican whose efforts to isolate and punish the Castro regime have been a central plank of her election strategy throughout her 24 years in Congress, hailed the State Department decision as “reaffirming the threat that the Castro regime represents.” Arash Aramesh, a national security analyst at Stanford Law School, blamed the continued branding of Cuba as a terrorism sponsor on politicians “pandering for a certain political base.” He also said President Obama and secretary of State John F. Kerry have failed to make a priority of removing the impediment to better relations with Cuba. “As much as I’d like to see the Castro regime gone and an open and free Cuba, it takes away from the State Department’s credibility when they include countries on the list that aren’t even close” to threatening Americans, Aramesh said.

#### Terrorism is only found in the United States as plots against Cuba

**Whitney 5-8-2013** (T. Whitney Jr., W. T. Whitney Jr., Monthly Review Magazine Staff Writer, and member of Veterans for Peace. He writes on Latin American issues, “Reflections on Anti-Cuban Terror”, MR Zine, <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2013/whitney080513.html>)

The [U.S. government](http://monthlyreview.org/2001/11/01/the-united-states-is-a-leading-terrorist-state) itself is a purveyor of terrorism.  Its wars, drones, economic sanctions, puppet insurgencies, torture regimens, and prison abuses terrorize peoples throughout the world.  The United States exports spies and informants and supports the militarized police forces and national armies of puppet governments.  Terror fostered by the United States aggravates hostilities and swells enemy ranks.  Vicious cycles ensue and conflicts expand.  Openings then multiply for the U.S. government to claim victimization and to rationalize its own terror attacks. Cuba, however, stands apart from this deadly interchange seen elsewhere.  Terror strikes in only one direction -- against Cuba.  Cuban sources indicate that U.S.-based terrorists have killed almost 3,500 people over 50 years, either Cubans or friends of Cuba.  By contrast, U.S. military and intelligence officials now and then reiterate that Cuba represents no military or economic threat to the United States. Yet the U.S. government maintains Cuba on its list of state sponsors of terrorism.  Apologists point to Basque separatists welcomed in Cuba and to sanctuary given leftist Colombian guerrillas.  But Spain asked that Cuba take in the Basques, and Colombia embraced Cuba's offer to host government negotiations with the guerrillas.  So, political refuge provided for [Assata Shakur](http://www.nlg.org/news/announcements/national-lawyers-guild-urges-fbi-respect-political-asylum-status-assata-shakur) has long been cited.  Having escaped from a U.S. prison, the black liberation combatant moved to Cuba. The United States recently simultaneously announced that Cuba will remain on its list of terror-sponsoring states and that, conveniently enough, Assata Shakur was being placed on the FBI's ten "most wanted terrorist" list, as well as that the bounty for her capture and return to the United States was raised to $2 million.  Many legal observers, however, remain highly critical of the prosecution and trial in 1977 through which she was convicted of murdering a New Jersey policeman. Considering that Cuba is quite blameless, refusing to engage in tit-for-tat, one may ask: Why have terror attacks against Cuba continued? One answer is that the U.S. government, as minder of an empire, is serious about its duty to counter revolutionary and anti-imperialist movements from their earliest stirrings to their takings of power and beyond.  U.S. governments have been dealing with Cuban revolutionaries for almost 150 years.  In reaction to anti-annexationist, anti-racist independence struggles led by Jose Marti and Antonio Maceo, the United States ended up invading Cuba.  U.S. troops helped beat down an Afro-Cuban uprising in 1912.  Then in the early 1930s came Cuban student and labor mobilizations, anti-imperialist in nature -- harbingers of a socialist revolution that took charge in 1959.  Special treatment for Cuba may stem, in part, from enmity to an anti-imperialism that never quits.

#### Not a terrorist threat – harsh embargo uses the political pretext of terrorism

Glaser 2013 (3-1-13, John Glaser, Editorial Assistant at The American Conservative Magazine Government Affairs, Foreign Policy Intern at Cato Institute and Koch Fellow Summer Intern at The Center for College Affordability and Productivity through The Institute for Humane Studies, “US: Cuba is a State Sponsor of Terrorism”, <http://news.antiwar.com/2013/03/01/us-cuba-is-a-state-sponsor-of-terrorism/>)

The United States is grasping at straws in justifying the continued economic embargo on Cuba by claiming the country is in a category with Iran, Sudan, and Syria as officially recognized state sponsors of terrorism. Washington, of course, refuses to provide any evidence of this, even as the charge of Cuba’s “support for acts of international terrorism” is increasingly questioned. Responding to press reports that Obama’s new Secretary of State John Kerry was considering lifting the harsh economic sanctions on Cuba, State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland such rumors are false. “This department has no current plans to remove Cuba from the state sponsor of terrorism list,” said Nuland. “We review this every year, and at the current moment we — when the last review was done in 2012 –didn’t see cause to remove them.” Cuba has elicited particular ire from Washington ever since the Eisenhower administration, a byproduct of Cold War justifications for US grand strategy, which seeks to maintain hegemony and crush economic, geo-political, or ideological defiance. The claim of being a state sponsor of terrorism is a mere pretext, a blanket accusation Washington applies to any government it doesn’t like (and one that ignores America’s own history of supporting and carrying out international terrorism). A State Department report last year found that Cuba’s ties to so-called terrorist groups are tenuous at best. Cuba has repeatedly reached out Washington, as President Raul Castro did last summer, insisting that Cuba “is willing to mend fences with bitter Cold War foe the United States and sit down to discuss anything, as long as it is a conversation between equals,” The Associated Press reported. “Any day they want, the table is set. This has already been said through diplomatic channels,” Castro said. “If they want to talk, we will talk.” But the Obama administration has refused, intent on continuing to isolate Cuba and maintain the embargo.

### Aff Solves – Cuba Counterterror

#### Sanctions hurt aid in peace talks to solve terrorism

Bogs and Thale 2012 (Clay Boggs is WOLA's Program Officer for Cuba and for Rights and Development. Geoff Thale is WOLA’s Program Director. Mr. Thale has studied Cuba issues since the mid-1990s and traveled to Cuba more than a dozen times, including organizing delegations of academics and members of Congress. 9-21-12, “US Interests Clash with Policy Toward Cuba”, http://www.wola.org/commentary/us\_interests\_clash\_with\_policy\_toward\_cuba)

On September 4, it was publicly announced that Colombia had been talking with FARC rebels in Havana, Cuba for six months (see Adam Isacson’s commentary [here](http://www.wola.org/commentary/hope_for_peace_in_colombia_reasons_for_optimism_awareness_of_obstacles)). These dialogues led to a framework for more formal talks. The United States has spent billions of dollars aiding Colombia, but it is Norway and Cuba, not the United States, that are the international mediators. To its credit, the White House issued a statement endorsing the talks. But the lack of normal diplomatic relations with Cuba complicates the United States’ ability to play the supportive role that the process deserves. (And the fact that we keep Cuba on a list of “state sponsors of terrorism” at a time when they are mediating a peace process that could dismantle a terrorist group hurts our credibility in the hemisphere). On September 13, the U.S. Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control released a report titled Preventing a Security Crisis in the Caribbean. The report argues that increased enforcement in Mexico and Central America will likely cause trafficking routes to shift back to the Caribbean. In an addendum to the report, Senator Dianne Feinstein notes that the current de facto U.S. collaboration with Cuba, through the Coast Guard, is effective at interdicting drugs. The Senator makes a series of constructive recommendations for advancing law enforcement cooperation between the United States and Cuba. WOLA advocates such strategic cooperation with Cuba as a way to advance mutual interests and has led multiple delegations to Cuba to explore these issues (see George Withers’ commentary [here](http://www.wola.org/commentary/building_bridges_in_unlikely_places_us_cuban_cooperation_on_security_issues)). Without exaggerating the benefits of drug interdiction operations per se, the minimal cooperation permitted by current U.S. policy is a textbook example of how short-sighted domestic politics undercut pragmatic partnership.

#### Cuba has engaged in counterterrorism efforts and sought to work with the US

Daily Times 5-3-13 (No Author Listed, “Cuba Condemns All Acts of Terrorism” <http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2013\05\03\story_3-5-2013_pg7_23>)

Cuba condemns all acts of terrorism. HAVANA: The Cuban Ministry of Foreign Relations has said that the country condemns all acts of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. It also condemns all actions aimed at encouraging, supporting, financing or covering up any terrorist act, method or practice. “The Cuban territory has never been used, nor will it be ever used to mastermind, finance or carry out terrorist acts against any country, including the United States. Cuba has always played an exemplary role in facing terrorism,” the ministry said in a statement. It said that Cuba has taken legislative and other measures to prevent and suppress all terrorist acts and activities and those directly or indirectly related to them, including the ones associated with financing terrorism, border protection and surveillance, arms trafficking, judicial cooperation, and accession to international legal instruments on preventing and suppressing international terrorism. Cuba is a state party to the 14 existing international conventions on terrorism, and strictly complies with the obligations under United Nations Security Council resolutions 1267, 1373, 1540 and 1989 on the matter and it has participated actively in the debates on the work of the committee against the terrorism of that institution. Cuba maintains its insoslayable commitment with the application of the Global Strategy of Nations United against Terrorism. In the United Nations, Cuba has participated and follows with extreme attention the debates in relation to a future General Convention on Terrorism. Cuba considers an imperative the adoption of a Convention of that type of general reach, by means of which they are managed to cover the deficiencies and omissions legal within the framework effective and allows to undertake on a coherent form the international actions against this flagellum. On 20 December 2001, the National Assembly of People’s Power of the Republic of Cuba enacted Act 93 “Against Acts of Terrorism”, which classified all acts of international terrorism as serious crimes, and established very severe penalties. The ministry said that Cuba has also taken measures to prevent and suppress all activities related to financing terrorism. Since 1997, following the entry into force of Resolution 91/97 of the Minister-President of the Central Bank of Cuba, the Cuban banking and financial system has been implementing systematic measures to prevent and detect illegal capital flows. It said that Cuba has stepped up its strict border controls as a result of the adoption of Security Council Resolutions1267, 1373 and 1540. “Cuba does not possess and has no intention of possessing any sort of weapon of mass destruction, and fulfills its obligations under the international instruments it has signed concerning nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. All programmes related to these fields are strictly peaceful, permanently and rigorously monitored by relevant national authorities, and subject to the surveillance of relevant international organizations. Possessing this kind of weapons has never been part of the Cuban national defence strategy,” the statement read. In accordance with resolution 1267 and 1989, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Cuba submits periodic reports to Cuban consulates and other relevant authorities, about updated Consolidated Lists issued by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to said resolution, also known as Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee. Cuba has signed 21 agreements on legal assistance and repeatedly expressed its permanent willingness to cooperate with all States in this field. In this spirit, Cuba has cooperated, even actively, with the US government. On four occasions (November 2001, December 2001, March 2002 and February 2012), Cuba proposed to the US Government a draft Program of bilateral cooperation for combating terrorism, which was rejected or left without answer.

### No Impact – Defense

#### Terrorism does not threaten civilization

Buchanan 2007 (Patrick Buchanan, former Presidential candidate, former senior Ford adviser, MSNBC political analyst, September 21, 07, “Is Terrorism a Mortal Threat?” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/09/is_terrorism_a_mortal_threat.html>)

Terrorism, said Powell, is not a mortal threat to America. "What is the greatest threat facing us now?" Powell asked. "People will say it's terrorism. But are there any terrorists in the world who can change the American way of life or our political system? No. Can they knock down a building? Yes. Can they kill somebody? Yes. But can they change us? No. Only we can change ourselves. So what is the great threat we are facing?" History and common sense teach that Powell speaks truth. Since 9-11, 100,000 Americans have been murdered -- as many as we lost in Vietnam, Korea and Iraq combined. Yet, not one of these murders was the work of an Islamic terrorist, and all of them, terrible as they are, did not imperil the survival of our republic. Terrorists can blow up our buildings, assassinate our leaders, and bomb our malls and stadiums. They cannot destroy us. Assume the worst. Terrorists smuggle an atom bomb into New York harbor or into Washington, D.C., and detonate it. Horrible and horrifying as that would be -- perhaps 100,000 dead and wounded -- it would not mean the end of the United States. It would more likely mean the end of Iran, or whatever nation at which the United States chose to direct its rage and retribution. Consider. Between 1942 and 1945, Germany and Japan, nations not one-tenth the size of the United States, saw their cities firebombed, and their soldiers and civilians slaughtered in the millions. Japan lost an empire. Germany lost a third of its territory. Both were put under military occupation. Yet, 15 years later, Germany and Japan were the second and third most prosperous nations on Earth, the dynamos of their respective continents, Europe and Asia. Powell's point is not that terrorism is not a threat. It is that the terror threat must be seen in perspective, that we ought not frighten ourselves to death with our own propaganda, that we cannot allow fear of terror to monopolize our every waking hour or cause us to give up our freedom. For all the blather of a restored caliphate, the "Islamofascists," as the neocons call them, cannot create or run a modern state, or pose a mortal threat to America. The GNP of the entire Arab world is not equal to Spain's. Oil aside, its exports are equal to Finland's.

#### Nuclear terrorism won’t cause extinction.

**Frost 05** (Robin, teaches political science at Simon Fraser University, British Colombia, “Nuclear Terrorism after 9/11,” Adelphi Papers, December)

An existential threat. When applied to nuclear terrorism, the phrase ‘existential threat’ implies that a state such as the United States could be destroyed by terrorists wielding nuclear weapons. Yet to destroy the United States or any other large industrial state, in the sense of inflicting such damage to its government, economy, population and infrastructure that it could no longer function as a coherent political and economic entity, would require a large number of well-placed nuclear weapons with yields in the tens or hundreds of kilotons. It is unlikely that terrorists could successfully obtain, emplace and detonate a single nuclear weapon, while no plausible radiological device or devices could do any significant damage on a national level.

## A2 Rouge DA

### Non Unique

#### Non unique- the US allows travel and trade with some of the most brutal and repressive regimes on earth

[Steve Chapman](http://reason.com/people/steve-chapman/all) [a columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune]¶ It's Time to End the U.S. Embargo of Cuba¶ The U.S. government has been tireless in pursuing a policy that does not look better with time¶ April 15, 2013¶ <http://reason.com/archives/2013/04/15/its-time-to-end-the-us-embargo-of-cuba>

Rubio claimed that people who make visits to Cuba "either don't realize or don't care that they're essentially funding the regime's systematic trampling of people's human rights." Such activity, he said, "provides money to a cruel, repressive and murderous regime."¶ That may be true. But U.S. law allows Americans to visit the island according to certain rules enforced by the Treasury Department, and some 500,000 people from the U.S. go each year. The rules for cultural trips were tightened last year after Rubio griped that they were too lax.¶ "The trip was handled according to a standard licensing procedure for federally approved 'people to people' cultural tours to the island," reported Reuters, "and the power couple received no special treatment, said Academic Arrangements Abroad, the New York-based group that organized the trip."¶ When it comes to sending money to a "cruel, repressive, murderous regime," Rubio's outrage is strangely selective. The same accusation could be laid against anyone who travels to China, Vietnam or Burma -- all of which are open to American visitors, as far as Washington is concerned.¶ Our willingness to trade with them stems from the belief that economic improvement and contact with outsiders will foster liberalization rather than retard it. But the opposite approach is supposed to produce this kind of progress in Cuba.¶ Do trade and tourism work to weaken repression? The evidence is mixed. But our attempted economic strangulation of Cuba has been an emphatic bust. We keep trying it, and the communist government remains in full control, making a mockery of our strategy.¶ The U.S. government has been tireless in pursuing a policy that does not look better with time. It could benefit from the advice of W.C. Fields, who said, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again. Then give up. No use being a damned fool about it."

## A2 Red Spread

#### Cold War mentality towards Cuba is outdated- they’re not a threat

[DELIA LLOYD](http://www.politicsdaily.com/bloggers/delia-lloyd/) [Delia Lloyd is a writer based in London. Her work has appeared in The New York Times, The International Herald Tribune, and The Financial Times. Previously,she worked as a producer at Chicago Public Radio and taught political science at the University of Chicago] August 24, 2010¶ Ten Reasons to Lift the Cuba Embargo¶ <http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/08/24/ten-reasons-to-lift-the-cuba-embargo/>

4. It's out of date. To argue that U.S.-Cuban policy is an anachronism is putting it mildly. In an international climate marked by cooperation on issues ranging from terrorism to global financial crises, holding on to this [last vestige of the Cold War foreign policy](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rep-barbara-lee/mr-president-lift-the-tra_b_687580.html) no longer makes sense. (Bear in mind that the young people now entering college [were not even alive when Czechoslovakia existed](http://www.beloit.edu/mindset/2014.php).) Sure, there's still tension between the United States and Russia. But the recent [renegotiation of the START agreement](http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2010/03/newstart.php) on nuclear proliferation reinforces the notion that the Cold War is no longer the dominant prism for understanding that bilateral relationship, much less the Cuban-American one.

## A2 Topicality

#### Lifting the embargo is trade liberalization and trade liberalization is economic engagement

ONE [international anti-poverty activist network] 6 Ways to boost economic engagement with Africa¶ March 12, 2013 http://www.one.org/us/2013/03/12/6-ways-to-boost-economic-engagement-with-africa/

In the report, Senator Coons lays out the case for an economic engagement policy with Africa that will be beneficial to Americans and Africans alike. As Coons points out, “[T]here is a clear and pressing need for increased US economic engagement in sub-Saharan Africa.¶ [Read the report here](http://www.coons.senate.gov/embracing-africas-economic-potential)¶ Increased trade facilitates growth for US businesses as well as our African partners, simultaneously strengthening our own economy and Africa’s emerging markets. In addition to creating jobs here at home, investment abroad allows US companies to project American values in critical areas of the world.” The report clearly illustrates the investment potential in Africa.¶ The report lays out six key recommendations for US policymakers as they consider economic engagement with Africa:¶ - Support African-led efforts to improve the business climate on the continent and remove barriers to trade; - Reauthorize and strengthen the [African Growth and Opportunity Act](http://www.one.org/us/moment/agoa/) well in advance of its 2015 expiration; - Improve coordination between US government agencies and develop a comprehensive interagency strategy for increased investment in sub-Saharan Africa; - Increase the presence of US Foreign Commercial Service Officers in sub-Saharan Africa to help US companies navigate the business climate in the region; - Increase support for agencies that provide financing to encourage US commercial engagement overseas, mitigate investment risks, and generate a profit for American taxpayers; and - Engage the African diaspora community in the United States to strengthen economic ties.

#### Economic engagement is rolling back protectionist trade policy

[James A. Dorn](http://www.cato.org/people/james-dorn) [the vice president for academic affairs, editor of the [Cato Journal](http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/index.html), and director of Cato’s annual monetary conference. His research interests include trade and human rights, economic reform in China, and the future of money. From 1984 to 1990, he served on the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars. He has lectured in Estonia, Germany, Hong Kong, Russia, and Switzerland and has directed international conferences in London, Shanghai, Moscow, and Mexico City. Dorn has been a visiting scholar at the Central European University in Prague and at Fudan University in Shanghai and is currently professor of economics at Towson University in Maryland] Economic Engagement Makes Sense¶ ¶ This article is an updated version of an article that appeared in the DC Examiner, October 11, 2006.¶ http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/economic-engagement-makes-sense

Rather than listen to Senators Schumer and Graham, the new Congress would be wise to follow a policy of “long-term strategic economic engagement,” as advocated by Secretary Paulson. Unlike the two senators, who have visited China only once, in March of this year, Mr. Paulson, former CEO of Goldman Sachs, has visited China many times and has a deep understanding of its financial markets.¶ In a major policy speech in Washington, just prior to his trip to Beijing last month, the secretary argued, “Protectionist policies do not work and the collateral damage from these policies is high.” He also believes that increasing economic freedom in China will eventually lead to political reform, as it has in other countries. However, we should not expect this to happen overnight; patience is a virtue.¶ The important thing is to keep China moving in the direction of economic liberalism. The reason is simple, said Paulson: “Economic liberalization—with the interdependence and the growth that it brings—can play an important role in advancing the cause of peace and stability.”¶ Although it is proper to criticize China for its human rights violations, its lack of a transparent legal system, and its violations of intellectual property rights, we should not ignore the substantial progress China has made since it embarked on economic liberalization in 1978.¶ U.S. economic security, as well as China’s, will depend on promoting economic liberalism, rather than fostering protectionism. Any missteps that weaken the liberal global economic order and fuel economic nationalism will undermine a constructive U.S.-China policy of engagement.

## A2 PICs

### A/T “End Part of the Embargo”

#### Should end the entire economic embargo at once- piecemeal reform like the CP is just more imperial game playing

Michelle Chase [Michelle Chase is a doctoral candidate in the history department of New York University. She is writing a dissertation on the gender politics of the Cuban Revolution, writing for NACLA- North American Congress on Latin America]¶ The Bigger Picture of the Cuban Embargo and Travel Ban¶ Apr 28 2009¶ <https://nacla.org/news/bigger-picture-cuban-embargo-and-travel-ban>

Last week, on the eve of the Summit of the Americas held in Trinidad and Tobago, President Barack Obama announced new measures to permit unlimited Cuban-American travel and remittances to the island. These relaxations immediately set off predictions that the entire travel ban would soon be lifted. And in fact, there are bills in both the House and Senate that aim to do just that.¶ The excitement over these new possibilities, however, should be tempered with a note of caution.¶ Although there have always been important voices raised in the United States over the injustice of the embargo, much of the progressive mobilization effort of recent years has focused on a complete end to the travel ban, demanding the right to travel “for all, not for some.” The campaign has generated support partly by casting the embargo as a violation of U.S. citizens’ freedom to travel.¶ But as full liberalization of travel now looms, it is clearer than ever that a progressive opposition to U.S. Cuba policy needs to focus on ending the entire embargo, and for the right, big-picture reasons: The embargo violates Cuban sovereignty and is patently imperialist. Otherwise, the momentum for U.S. Cuba policy reform will be co-opted by representatives of the tourism, agricultural and telecommunication industries.¶ The new relaxations announced by Obama are, of course, mostly positive and welcome; any measures that diminish the daily hardships endured by Cubans would be. But these changes will also ensure that money and goods sent to Cuba will go through private hands and family networks, rather than allowing the Cuban state to guide the distribution of those resources. While the socialist government has a decidedly mixed record on overturning historic inequalities based on race and class, we nevertheless know, based on what happened during the Special Period, that resources funneled through private channels greatly exacerbate existing class and especially race tensions.¶ Obama's reforms will play out differently among Miami's increasingly diverse Cuban community. Recently emigrated, less educated, darker-skinned migrants will likely use the reforms to help improve their families' situation back on the island, primarily at the level of everyday purchases like food, clothes, and home repairs. However, assistance sent by Miami's more established and affluent Cuban-Americans could help their relatives on the island acquire centrally-located property on the black market or proffer the substantial bribes that have increasingly become necessary to secure small business licenses and sometimes even to obtain plum jobs in the tourist sector.¶ Thus, the new measures will not benefit all Cubans equally. They will raise the consumption levels of those with family abroad and, less directly, of those employed in the service sector in Havana and other tourist destinations. But the embargo, which remains firmly in place through the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and the 1996 Helms-Burton Act, will still block things like the importation of badly needed modern farming equipment and key infrastructural improvements.¶ Fully ending the travel ban is necessary and desirable, but doing so while leaving the embargo in place is one way that Washington is trying to scuttle Havana's ability to guide its own internal affairs.